arXiv:math/0306255v4 [math.DG] 3 May 2006

Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of noncompact symplectic manifolds

Guangcun Lu *
Department of Mathematics, Beijing Normal University
Beijing 100875, P.R.China
(gclu@bnu.edu.cn)

Received: 8 October 2003
Accepted: 16 November 2004

Abstract

This paper constructs and studies the Gromov-Witten invariants and their properties for noncompact geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds. Two localization formulas for GW-invariants are also proposed and proved. As applications we get solutions of the generalized string equation and dilation equation and their variants. The more solutions of WDVV equation and quantum products on cohomology groups are also obtained for the symplectic manifolds with finitely dimensional cohomology groups. To realize these purposes we further develop the language introduced by Liu-Tian to describe the virtual moduli cycle (defined by Liu-Tian, Fukaya-Ono, Li-Tian, Ruan and Siebert).

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification 14N35, 53D45

Contents

1 Introduction and main results **2**

2 The stable maps in noncompact geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds **7**
- 2.1 Geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds . . . 7
- 2.2 Pseudo-holomorphic curves in geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds . . . 9
- 2.3 Stable maps in geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds . . . 10
- 2.4 Strong $L^{k,p}$-topology and local uniformizer . . . 13
  - 2.4.1 Local deformation of a stable curve . . . 13
  - 2.4.2 Local deformation of a stable J-map . . . 15
  - 2.4.3 Strong $L^{k,p}$-topology . . . 16
  - 2.4.4 Local uniformizers . . . 17

---

*The author was supported in part by NNSF 19971045 and 10371007 of China.

3 Virtual moduli cycles **18**
3.1 The local construction 18
3.2 The global construction 22

4 Gromov-Witten invariants **42**
4.1 Definition and simple properties 42
4.2 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of sections s_i. 48
4.3 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of W_i. 49
4.4 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of K_0. 53
4.5 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of almost complex structures $J \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega, \mu)$. 57
4.6 The dependence of the homology class in (4.6) on Riemannian metrics and symplectic forms 57
4.7 The case of a compact symplectic manifold with contact type boundaries. 58

5 The properties of Gromov-Witten invariants **60**
5.1 The localization formulas 60
5.2 The composition laws 64
5.3 Reduction formulas 74

6 Quantum Cohomology, WDVV Equation and String Equation **79**
6.1 Generalized string equation and dilation equation 79
6.2 The WDVV equation 82
6.3 Quantum cohomology 83

1 Introduction and main results

This paper is a continuation of my paper [Lu1]. In [Lu1] we defined the Gromov-Witten invariants on semi-positive noncompact geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds by combining Ruan-Tian's method([RT1]) with that of McDuff-Salamon ([McS]), and also used them to generalize work on the topological rigidity of Hamiltonian loops on semi-positive closed symplectic manifolds ([LMP]) to the Hamiltonian loops with compact support on this class of noncompact symplectic manifolds. Not long ago Jun Li and Gang Tian [LiT1] developed a beautiful algebraic method to establish general theory of GW-invariants on a smooth projective algebraic variety (see [Be] for a different treatment) which satisfy the quantum cohomology axioms proposed by Kontsevich and Mannin in [KM] based upon predictions of the general properties of topological quantum field theory [W2]. Soon after several groups independently developed different new techniques to construct Gromov-Witten invariants on any closed symplectic manifolds (cf. [FuO, LT2, R, Sie]). Actually the method constructing Floer homology by Liu-Tian [LiuT1] provided another approach to realize this goal. These new methods were also used in recent studies of this field, symplectic topology and Mirror symmetry (cf. [CR, FuOOO, IP1-2, LiR, LiuT2, LiuT3, LLY1-2, Lu3-4, Mc2] etc.) In this paper we further develop the virtual moduli cycle techniques introduced in [LiuT1, LiuT2-3] to generalize work of [Lu1] to arbitrary noncompact geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds. It should be noted that unlike the case of closed symplectic manifolds our invariants do not have the best invariance properties as expected. This is natural for noncompact case. But we give their invariance properties as well as we possibly can. Actually in many cases one does not need very strong invariants because the almost complex structures are only auxiliary tools to realize the purposes in the studies of symplectic topology and geometry. On the other hand the initial insight came from physicist Witten's topological σ models of two-dimensional gravity (cf. [W1, W2]). According to Witten [W1] the two dimensional nonlinear sigma model is a theory of maps from a Riemannian surface Σ to a Riemannian manifold M. Gromov's theory of pseudo-holomorphic curves [Gr2] provided a powerful mathematical tool for it. The latter requires not only that M should have an almost complex structure, but also that M should have an additional structure–a symplectic structure. It is well-known that the existence and classification of the symplectic structures on a closed almost complex manifold is a difficult mathematics question. However early in his thesis in 1969 [Gr1] Gromov completely resolved the corresponding question on an open almost complex manifold.

Recall that a Riemannian manifold (M,μ) is called *geometrically bounded* if its sectional curvature is bounded above and has injectivity radius $i(M,\mu)>0$. (It is weaker than the usual one for which the absolute value of the sectional curvature is required to be bounded above.) Such a Riemannian metric is called geometrically bounded and is always complete. The existence of such Riemannian metrics were proved in [G]. Let $\mathcal{R}(M)$ denote the set of all Riemannian metrics on M, and $\mathcal{GR}(M)\subset\mathcal{R}(M)$ be the subset of those Riemannian metrics on M whose injectivity radius are more than zero and whose sectional curvatures have the upper bound. Clearly,$\mathcal{GR}(M)$ might not be connected even if it is nonempty. Let (M,ω) be a symplectic manifold and $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ be the space of all ω-compatible almost complex structures on M. The latter is contractible and each $J\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ gives a Riemannian metric

$$g_J(u,v)=\omega(u,Jv),\quad \forall u,v\in TM.$$

A symplectic manifold (M,ω) without boundary is said to be *geometrically bounded* if there exist an almost complex structure J and a geometrically bounded Riemannian metric μ on M such that for some positive constants α_0 and β_0,

$$\omega(X,JX)\ge\alpha_0\|X\|^2_\mu\quad\text{and}\quad|\omega(X,Y)|\le\beta_0\|X\|_\mu\|Y\|_\mu,\quad\forall X,Y\in TM \tag{1.1}$$

(cf. [ALP, Gr2, Sik]). Later we also say such a J to be (ω,μ)-*geometrically bounded.* In §2.1 we shall prove that (1.1) is equivalent to the fact that g_J is *quasi isometric* to μ, i.e., there exist positive constants C,C' such that

$$C\|u\|_\mu\le\|u\|_{g_J}\le C'\|u\|_\mu\quad\forall u\in TM.$$

Clearly, the quasi isometric metrics have the same completeness and incompleteness. Denote by

$$\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu) \tag{1.2}$$

the set of all (ω,μ)-geometrically bounded almost complex structures in $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$. In Proposition 2.3 we shall study the connectedness of it. A family of Riemannian metrics $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ on M is said to be *uniformly geometrically bounded* if their injectivity radiuses have a uniform positive lower bound and their sectional curvatures have a uniform upper bound. A 1-parameter family of $(M,\omega_t,J_t,\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds starting at $(M,\omega_0,J_0,\mu_0)=(M,\omega,J,\mu)$ is called a *weak deformation* of a geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ) if (i) both $(\omega_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ and $(J_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ are smoothly dependent t with respect to the C^∞-weak topology, (ii) $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a path in $\mathcal{GR}(M)$ and is also uniformly geometrically bounded, (iii) there exist uniform positive constants α_0 and β_0, and a distance d on M such that for all $t\in[0,1]$ and the distance functions d_{μ_t} induced by μ_t,

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} d_{\mu_t}\ge d,\\ \omega_t(X,J_tX)\ge\alpha_0\|X\|^2_{\mu_t}\quad\text{and}\\ |\omega_t(X,Y)|\le\beta_0\|X\|_{\mu_t}\|Y\|_{\mu_t},\quad\forall X,Y\in TM.\end{array}\right.\tag{1.3}$$

Note that the C^0-strong topology (also called the *Whitney* C^0-topology) on $\mathcal{R}(M)$ does not have a countable base at any point for noncompact M in general. However, all metrics μ_t of a C^0-strong continuous path $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{R}(M)$ are uniformly quasi isometric, i.e., there exists positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$C_1\|u\|_{\mu_0}\le\|u\|_{\mu_t}\le C_2\|u\|_{\mu_0}\;\forall u\in TM\quad\text{and}\quad t\in[0,1].$$

We define a C^0 *super-strong* topology on $\mathcal{GR}(M)$ as follows: Let $(S,\ge)$ be a net in $\mathcal{GR}(M)$, we say that *it converges to* $\mu\in\mathcal{GR}(M)$ *with respect to the* C^0 *super-strong topology* if it converges to μ in the C^0-strong topology and all metrics in the net are uniformly geometrically bounded. Clearly, a continuous path $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{GR}(M)$ with respect to the C^0 super-strong topology is always uniformly geometrically bounded. However it is still difficult to check that a path in $\mathcal{GR}(M)$ is continuous with respect to the C^0 super-strong topology. Observe that the sectional curvature of a Riemannian metric is uniformly continuous with respect to the C^2-strong topology on $\mathcal{R}(M)$. By the local coordinate expression of the geodesic equations and the proof of the fundamental theorem of the linear ordinary differential equation systems it is not hard to prove that if a Riemannian metric g on M has the sectional curvature K_g less than a constant K and the injectivity radius $i(M,g)>0$ then there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}(g)$ of g in $\mathcal{R}(M)$ with respect to the C^∞-strong topology (actually the C^3-strong topology seem to be enough) such that every metric $h\in\mathcal{U}(M)$ has the injectivity radius $i(M,h)\ge\frac{1}{2}i(M,g)>0$ and the sectional curvature $K_h\le K+1$. Therefore *a continuous path* $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ *in* $\mathcal{GR}(M)$ *with respect to the* C^∞*-strong topology is also a continuous path with respect to the* C^0 *super-strong topology.* A 1-parameter family of $(M,\omega_t,J_t,\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds starting at $(M,\omega_0,J_0,\mu_0)=(M,\omega,J,\mu)$ is called a *strong deformation* of a geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ) if (i) both $(\omega_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ and $(J_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ are smoothly dependent t with respect to the C^∞-strong topology, (ii) $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a continuous path in $\mathcal{GR}(M)$ with respect to the C^0 super-strong topology. It is not hard to prove that a strong deformation of a geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ) must be a weak deformation of (M,ω,J,μ). Denote by

$$\mathrm{Symp}_0^S(M,\omega)\tag{1.4}$$

the connected component containing id_M of $\mathrm{Symp}_0(M,\omega)$ with respect to the C^∞-strong topology.

For $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{C},\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ let $H^*(M,\mathbb{K})$ (resp. $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{K})$) be the $\mathbb{K}$-coefficient cohomology (resp. $\mathbb{K}$-coefficient cohomology with compact support). Given a geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ) of dimension $2n$, $A\in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$ and integers $g\ge0,m>0$ with $2g+m\ge3$, let $\kappa\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\mathbb{Q})$ and $\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le m}\subset H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})\cup H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ satisfy

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^m\deg\alpha_i+\mathrm{codim}(\kappa)=2c_1(M)(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)+2m.\tag{1.5}$$

If $\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le m}$ has at least one contained in $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ we can define a number

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\in\mathbb{Q} \tag{1.6}$$

in (4.7). When (1.5) is not satisfied we simply define $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)$ to be zero. The following theorem summarizes up the part results in §4.

Theorem 1.1. *The rational number $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)$ in (1.6) has the following properties:*

(i) It is multilinear and supersymmetric on $\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m$.

(ii) It is independent of choices of $J\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$.

(iii) It is invariant under the weak deformation of a geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ); specially, it only depends on the connected component of μ in $\mathcal{GR}(M)$ with respect to the C^∞ strong topology.

(iv) For any $\psi\in\mathrm{Symp}^S_0(M,\omega)$ it holds that

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\psi^*\mu,\psi^*J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\mathcal{G}W^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m).$$

It was proved in [Gr1] that an open manifold M has a symplectic structure if and only if M has an almost complex structure and that every symplectic form ω on M can be smoothly homotopy to an exact symplectic form through nondegenerate 2-forms on M. Therefore our Theorem 1.1 implies: *For a noncompact geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ) if there exists a Gromov-Witten invariant $\mathcal{G}W^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\ne 0$ then it cannot be deformed to an exact geometrically bounded symplectic manifold $(M,d\alpha,J_1,\mu_1)$ via the weak deformation.*

In §5.1 two localization formulas (Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.3) for GW-invariants are explicitly proposed and proved. Here the localization means that a (local) virtual moduli cycle constructed from a smaller moduli space is sometime enough for computation of some concrete GW-invariants. They are expected to be able simplify the computation for GW-invariants. In particular we use them in the proof of the composition laws in §5.2.

Let $\mathcal{F}_m:\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}$ be a map forgetting last marked point. It is a Lefschetz fibration and the integration along the fibre induces a map $(\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp$ from $\Omega^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m})$ to $\Omega^{*-2}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1})$ (see (5.25)). It also induces a "shriek" map $(\mathcal{F}_m)_!$ from $H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1};\mathbb{Q})$ to $H_{*+2}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m};\mathbb{Q})$ (see (5.26)). As expected Theorem 5.8 and Theorem 5.9 give desired reduction formulas.

Theorem 1.2. *If $(g,m)\ne(0,3),(1,1)$, then for any $\kappa\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1};\mathbb{Q})$, $\alpha_1\in H^*_c(M;\mathbb{Q})$, $\alpha_2,\cdots,\alpha_m\in H^*(M;\mathbb{Q})$ with $\deg\alpha_m=2$ it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}((\mathcal{F}_m)_!(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\alpha_m(A)\cdot\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m-1}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1}),\\&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1},\mathbf{1})=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}((\mathcal{F}_m)_*(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathbf{1}\in H^0(M,\mathbb{Q})$ is the identity.

Having these two formulas, as in [RT2] we follow [W2] to introduce the gravitational correlators $\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g,A}$ in (6.5) and define the free energy function $F^M_g(t^a_r;q)$ in (6.7) and Witten's generating function $F^M(t^a_r; q)$ in (6.8). It is claimed in our Theorem 6.1 that $F^M(t^a_r; q)$ and $F^M_g(t^a_r; q)$ respectively satisfy the expected generalized string equation and the dilation equation under some reasonable assumptions (6.1). In addition we also construct a family of new solutions for a few variants of the generalized string equation and the dilation equation in Theorem 6.2, which are also new even for the case of closed symplectic manifolds.

In the case that $\dim H^*(M) < \infty$, our Gromov-Witten invariants also satisfy the composition laws of some form. Let integers $g_i \ge 0$ and $m_i > 0$ satisfy: $2g_i + m_i \ge 3$, $i = 1, 2$. Set $g = g_1 + g_2$ and $m = m_1 + m_2$ and fix a decomposition $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ of $\{1, \cdots, m\}$ with $|Q_i| = m_i$. Then one gets a canonical embedding $\varphi_Q : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$. Let $\psi : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ be the natural embedding obtained by gluing together the last two marked points. Take a basis $\{\beta_i\}$ of $H^*(M)$ and a dual basis $\{\omega_i\}$ of them in $H^*_c(M)$, i.e., $\langle\omega_j, \beta_i\rangle = \int_M \beta_i \wedge \omega_j = \delta_{ij}$. Let $\eta^{ij} = \int_M \omega_i \wedge \omega_j$ and $c_{ij} = (-1)^{\deg\omega_i\cdot\deg\omega_j}\eta^{ij}$. Our Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 5.7 give the composition laws of the following forms.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume that* $\dim H^*(M) < \infty$*. Let* $\kappa \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}, \mathbb{Q})$*, and* $\alpha_i \in H^*(M, \mathbb{Q})$*,* $i = 1, \cdots, m$*. If some* $\alpha_t \in H^*_c(M, \mathbb{Q})$ *then*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\psi_*(\kappa); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) = \sum_{i,j} c_{ij} \cdot \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g-1,m+2}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m, \beta_i, \beta_j).$$

Moreover, let $\kappa_i \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_i,m_i}, \mathbb{Q})$*,* $i = 1, 2$*, and* $\alpha_s, \alpha_t \in H^*_c(M, \mathbb{Q})$ *for some* $s \in Q_1$ *and* $t \in Q_2$*. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1 \times \kappa_2); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) &= \epsilon(Q)(-1)^{\deg\kappa_2\sum_{i\in Q_1}\deg\alpha_i} \sum_{A=A_1+A_2} \\ \sum_{k,l} \eta^{kl} \cdot \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_1,g_1,m_1+1}&(\kappa_1; \{\alpha_i\}_{i\in Q_1}, \beta_k) \cdot \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_2,g_2,m_2+1}(\kappa_2; \beta_l, \{\alpha_i\}_{i\in Q_2}).\end{aligned}$$

Here $g = g_1 + g_2$ *and* $\epsilon(Q)$ *is the sign of permutation* $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ *of* $\{1, \cdots, m\}$ *with* $|Q_1| = m_1$ *and* $|Q_2| = m_2$*.*

If (M, ω) is a closed symplectic manifold it is easily proved that they are reduced to the ordinary ones. However they are unsatisfactory because we cannot obtain the desired WDVV equation and quantum products. Indeed, for a basis $\{\beta_i\}_{1\le i\le L}$ of $H^*(M, \mathbb{Q})$ as in Theorem 1.3 and $w = \sum t_i\beta_i \in H^*(M, \mathbb{C})$, we can only define $\underline{\alpha}$-Gromov-Witten potential

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}(w) = &\sum_{A\in H_2(M)} \sum_{m\ge\max(1,3-k)} \frac{1}{m!} \\ &\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,k+m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k+m}]; \underline{\alpha}, w, \cdots, w)q^A. \qquad (1.7)\end{aligned}$$

and prove that they satisfy WDVV-equation of our form in Theorem 6.3. Here $\underline{\alpha} = \{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le k}$ be a collection of nonzero homogeneous elements in $H^*_c(M, \mathbb{C}) \cup H^*(M, \mathbb{C})$ and at least one of them belongs to $H^*_c(M, \mathbb{C})$. Similarly, we can only define the quantum product on $QH^*(M, \mathbb{Q})$ of the following form

$$\alpha \star_{\underline{\alpha}} \beta = \sum_{A\in H_2(M)} \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,3+k}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3+k}]; \underline{\alpha}, \alpha, \beta, \beta_i)\eta_{ij}\beta_j q^A. \qquad (1.8)$$

and in Theorem 6.5 prove that $QH^*(M, \mathbb{Q})$ is a supercommutative ring without identity under the quantum product.

Using the method in this paper many results obtained on closed symplectic manifolds with GW-invariants theory may be generalized to this class of noncompact symplectic manifolds, i.e., the results in [Lu1, Lu4 and LiuT2] (adding a condition $\dim H^*(M) < +\infty$ if necessary) and the relative Gromov-Witten invariants and symplectic sums formula for them in [IP1, IP2 and LiR].

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 will discuss some properties of the moduli spaces of stable maps in noncompact geometrical symplectic manifolds and then construct local uniformizers. The construction of the virtual moduli cycle is completed in Section 3. In Section 4 we shall prove Theorem 1.1 and some simple properties for GW-invariants. Section 5 contains two localization formulas for GW-invariants and proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3. In Section 6 we construct a family of solutions of the generalized string equation, dilation equation and WDVV equation, and also define a family of quantum products.

Acknowledgements. I am very grateful to Dr. Leonardo Macarini for pointing out an error in the first version of this paper. I would also like to thank Professor Gang Tian for some discussions on the smoothness of virtual moduli cycles and concrete revision suggestions. The author thank the referee for pointing out an unclear point and a feasible revision. This revised version was finished during author's visit to ICTP Trieste and IHES Paris. I would like to express deep gratitude to Professors D. T. Lê and J. P. Bourguignon for their invitations and for the financial support and hospitality of both institutions.

2 The stable maps in noncompact geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds

In this section we first study almost complex structures on a geometrically bounded symplectic manifold and then discuss the pseudo-holomorphic curves and stable maps in this kind of manifolds. In §2.4 the strong $L^{k,p}$-topology and local uniformizers will be defined and constructed respectively.

2.1 Geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds

We first prove the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1. *For a Riemannian metric μ on M, $J \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ satisfies (1.1) if and only if the metric g_J is quasi isometric to μ.*
Proof. If (1.1) is satisfied, then for any $X \in TM$,

$$\alpha_0 \|X\|_\mu \le \|JX\|_{g_J} \le \beta_0 \|X\|_\mu.$$

Since $\|JX\|_{g_J} = \|X\|_{g_J}$ for every $X \in TM$, g_J is quasi isometric to μ.

Conversely, assume that $C_1\|X\|_\mu \le \|X\|_{g_J} \le C_2\|X\|_\mu$ for some positive constants C_1, C_2 and all $X \in TM$. Then for any $X, Y \in TM$ we have

$$|\omega(X, Y)| = |\omega(JX, JY)| = |g_J(JX, Y)| \le \|JX\|_{g_J}\|Y\|_{g_J} \le C_2^2\|X\|_\mu\|Y\|_\mu.$$

That is, (1.1) is satisfied for $\alpha_0 = C_1^2$ and $\beta_0 = C_2^2$. $\square$

Therefore a symplectic manifold (M,ω) is geometrically bounded if and only if $\mathcal{GR}(M) \cap \{g_J \,|\, J \in \mathcal{J}(M,\omega)\} \neq \emptyset$.

Next we need to study the connectivity of $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$. The first part of the following lemma is due to Sévennec (cf. Prop. 1.1.6 in Chapter II of [ALP] or Lemma 1.2.4 in [IS]).

Lemma 2.2. *Let (V,ω) be a $2n$-dimensional symplectic vector space and $\mathcal{J}(V,\omega)$ be the space of compatible linear complex structures on (V,ω). Fix a $J_0 \in \mathcal{J}(V,\omega)$ and corresponding inner product $g_0 = g_{J_0} = \omega \circ (\mathrm{Id} \times J_0)$. For $W \in \mathrm{End}(V)$ let W^t and $\|W\|_{g_0}$ denote the conjugation and norm of W with respect to g_0. Setting*

$$\mathcal{W}_{J_0} := \{W \in \mathrm{End}(V) \,|\, WJ_0 = -J_0W,\, W^t = W,\, \|W\|_{g_0} < 1\}$$

then

$$\mathbf{L} : \mathcal{J}(V,\omega) \to \mathcal{W}_{J_0},\ J \mapsto -(J - J_0)(J + J_0)^{-1}$$

is a diffeomorphism with the inverse map

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{L}^{-1} : \mathcal{W}_{J_0} \to \mathcal{J}(V,\omega),\ W \mapsto J_0(\mathrm{Id} - W)^{-1}(\mathrm{Id} + W).$$

Furthermore, if $J = \mathbf{K}(W) \in \mathcal{J}(V,\omega)$ is such that for some $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$,

$$g_J(v,v) \geq \alpha_0 g_0(v,v)\ \forall v \in V$$

then the smooth path $(J_t = \mathbf{K}(tW))_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{J}(V,\omega)$ also satisfies

$$g_{J_t}(v,v) \geq \alpha_0 g_0(v,v)\ \forall v \in V \,\text{and}\, t \in [0,1]. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. We only need to prove the second part. Note that $(\mathrm{Id} - W)^{-1}(\mathrm{Id} + W)$ is symmetric with respect to g_0 and that

$$g_J(v,v) = g_0(v, (\mathrm{Id} - W)^{-1}(\mathrm{Id} + W)v) \geq \alpha_0 g_0(v,v)\ \forall v \in V$$

if and only if

$$\min\{\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \,|\, \lambda \in \sigma(W)\} \geq \alpha_0,$$

or equivalently, $1 > \lambda \geq \frac{\alpha_0 - 1}{\alpha_0 + 1}$ for any $\lambda \in \sigma(W)$. It is easily checked that $1 > t\lambda \geq t\frac{\alpha_0-1}{\alpha_0+1} \geq \frac{\alpha_0-1}{\alpha_0+1}$ for any $t \in [0,1]$ and $\lambda \in \sigma(W)$. (2.1) follows. $\square$

Proposition 2.3. *For any symplectic manifold (M,ω) the space $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ is contractible with respect to the C^∞ weak topology. Moreover, for any geometrically bounded Riemannian metric μ on M with $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu) \neq \emptyset$, if $J_0, J_1 \in \mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$ satisfy (1.1) then there exists a smooth path $(J_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ connecting J_0 to J_1 such that*

$$\omega(u, J_t u) = g_{J_t}(u,u) \geq \frac{\alpha_0^3}{\beta_0^2}\|u\|_\mu^2\ \forall u \in TM \,\text{and}\, t \in [0,1].$$

In particular $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$ is connected with respect to the C^∞ weak topology.

Proof. $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ is always nonempty(cf. the proof of Proposition 2.50(i) in [McSa2]). Fix a $J_0\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$. Set $g_{J_0}=\omega\circ(\mathrm{Id}\times J_0)$ and

$$\mathcal{W}_{J_0}:=\{W\in\mathrm{End}(TM)\,|\,W(x)J_0(x)=-J_0(x)W(x),\;W^t(x)=W(x),\;\|W(x)\|_{g_0}<1\,\forall x\in M\},$$

where $W^t(x)$ is the conjugation of $W(x)$ with respect to g_{J_0}. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)\to\mathcal{W}_{J_0},\;J\mapsto-(J-J_0)(J+J_0)^{-1}$$

is a diffeomorphism with respect to the C^∞ weak topology on them. Since $\mathcal{W}_{J_0}$ is contractible, so is $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$.

Next we prove the second claim. Assume that $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$ is nonempty. Fix a $J_0\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$. Then for any $J\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$ there exists a unique $W\in\mathcal{W}_{J_0}$ such that $J=J_0(\mathrm{Id}-W)^{-1}(\mathrm{Id}+W)$. Let J_0 and J satisfy (1.1). We easily deduce that

$$\|J_0u\|_\mu\le\frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0}\|u\|_\mu,\quad\|u\|_\mu\le\frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0}\|J_0u\|_\mu$$
$$\|Ju\|_\mu\le\frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0}\|u\|_\mu,\quad\|u\|_\mu\le\frac{\beta_0}{\alpha_0}\|Ju\|_\mu$$

for all $u\in TM$. Using (1.1) again we get that

$$\min(g_{J_0}(u,u),g_J(u,u))\ge\alpha_0\|u\|^2_\mu\quad\text{and}\quad\max(g_{J_0}(u,u),g_J(u,u))\le\frac{\beta_0^2}{\alpha_0}\|u\|^2_\mu\;\forall u\in TM.$$

It follows from these that

$$g_J(u,u)\ge\frac{\alpha_0^2}{\beta_0^2}g_{J_0}(u,u)\;\forall u\in TM.$$

Note that we can assume that $\alpha_0<\beta_0$ and therefore $0<\frac{\alpha_0^2}{\beta_0^2}<1$. By Lemma 2.2, a smooth path $J_t=J_0(\mathrm{Id}-tW)^{-1}(\mathrm{Id}+tW)$, $t\in[0,1]$ in $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ connecting J_0 and $J_1=J$, satisfies

$$\omega(u,J_tu)=g_{J_t}(u,u)\ge\frac{\alpha_0^2}{\beta_0^2}g_0(u,u)\ge\frac{\alpha_0^3}{\beta_0^2}\|u\|^2_\mu\;\forall u\in TM\text{ and }t\in[0,1].$$

That is, $J_t\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$ for all $t\in[0,1]$. Proposition 2.3 is proved. □

Remark that the same reasoning may give the similar results for $\mathcal{J}_\tau(M,\omega)$ and $\mathcal{J}_\tau(M,\omega,J)$.

2.2 Pseudo-holomorphic curves in geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds

Let (M,ω,J,μ) be a geometrically bounded symplectic manifold satisfying (1.1). Since (M,J,μ) is a tame almost complex manifold we have the following version of Monotonicity principle(cf. [Sik, Prop.4.3.1(ii)]).

Lemma 2.4. *Let $C_0>0$ be an upper bound of all sectional curvatures K_μ of μ and $r_0=\min\{i(M,\mu),\pi/\sqrt{C_0}\}$. Assume that $h:S\to M$ is a J-holomorphic map from a compact connected Riemannian surface S with boundary to M. Let $p\in M$ and $0<r\le r_0$ be such that*

$$p\in h(S)\subset B_\mu(p,r)\quad\text{and}\quad h(\partial S)\subset B_\mu(p,r),$$

then

$$\mathrm{Area}_\mu(h(S)) \geq \frac{\pi\alpha_0}{4\beta_0} r^2. \tag{2.2}$$

In fact, by the comments below Definition 4.1.1 of [Sik] we may choose $C_1 = 1/\pi$ and $C_2 = \beta_0/\alpha_0$ in the present case. Moreover, C_6 in Proposition 4.4.1 of [Sik] is equal to $\frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}$.

Proposition 2.5([Sik, Prop.4.4.1]). *Let (M, ω, μ, J) be as above, and $h : S \to M$ be a J-holomorphic map from a connected compact Riemannian surface S to M. Assume that a compact subset $K \subset M$ is such that $h(S) \cap K \neq \emptyset$ and $h(\partial S) \subset K$. Then $f(S)$ is contained in*

$$U_\mu(K, \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}\mathrm{Area}_\mu(h(S))) = \{p \in M \mid d_\mu(p, K) \leq \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}\mathrm{Area}_\mu(h(S))\}.$$

In particular, if S is a connected closed Riemannian surface then

$$\mathrm{diam}_\mu(h(S)) \leq \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}\int_S h^*\omega. \tag{2.3}$$

Lemma 2.4 also leads to

Proposition 2.6. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.4, for any nonconstant J-holomorphic map $f : \Sigma \to M$ from a closed connected Riemannian surface Σ to M it holds that*

$$\int_\Sigma f^*\omega \geq \frac{\pi\alpha_0}{8\beta_0} r_0^2. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Assume that there is a nonconstant J-holomorphic map $f : \Sigma \to M$ from a closed connected Riemannian surface Σ to M such that

$$\int_\Sigma f^*\omega < \frac{\pi\alpha_0}{8\beta_0} r_0^2.$$

Take $z_0 \in \Sigma$ and let S be the connected component of $f^{-1}(B_\mu(p, 3r_0/4))$ containing $p = f(z_0)$. After perturbing $3r_0/4$ a bit we may assume that S is a Riemannian surface with smooth boundary. If $\partial S \neq \emptyset$ Lemma 2.4 gives

$$\int_S f^*\omega \geq \frac{\pi\alpha_0}{4\beta_0}(3r_0/4)^2 > \frac{\pi\alpha_0}{8\beta_0} r_0^2.$$

This contradicts the above assumption. Hence $S = \Sigma$ and $f(\Sigma) \subset B_\mu(p, 3r_0/4)$. But $3r_0/4 < i(M, \mu)$ and thus f is homotopic to the constant map. It follows that f is constant because f is J-holomorphic. □

2.3 Stable maps in geometrically bounded symplectic manifolds

Following Mumford, by a *semistable curve with m marked points*, one means a pair $(\Sigma; \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ of a connected Hausdorff topological space Σ and m different points $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \{z_1, \cdots, z_m\}$ on it such that there exist a finite family of smooth Riemann surfaces $\{\Sigma_s : s \in \Lambda\}$ and continuous maps

$\pi_{\Sigma_s}:\widetilde{\Sigma}_s\to\Sigma$ satisfying the following properties: (i) each π_{Σ_s} is a local homeomorphism; (ii) for each $p\in\Sigma$ it holds that $1\le\sum_s\sharp\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(p)\le 2$, and all points which satisfy $\sum_s\sharp\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(p)=2$ are isolated; (iii) for each z_i, $\sum_s\sharp\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(z_i)=1$.

The points in $\Sigma_{\rm sing}:=\{p\in\Sigma:\sum_s\sharp\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(p)=2\}$ are called singular points of Σ. Each singular point p such that $\sharp\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(p)=2$ is called the self-intersecting point of Σ. $\Sigma_s:=\pi_{\Sigma_s}(\widetilde{\Sigma}_s)$ is called the s^{th} components of Σ, and $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$ is called the smooth resolution of Σ_s. Each z_i is called the marked point. The points in $\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(\Sigma_{\rm sing})$ (resp. $\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(\bar{\mathbf{z}})$) are called the singular points (resp. the marked points) on $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$, respectively. Let m_s be the number of all singular and marked points on $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$ and g_s be the genus of $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$. The *genus* g of $(\Sigma;\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is defined by

$$1+\sum_s g_s+\sharp{\rm Inter}(\Sigma)-\sharp{\rm Comp}(\Sigma),$$

where $\sharp{\rm Inter}(\Sigma)$ and $\sharp{\rm Comp}(\Sigma)$ stand for the number of the intersecting points on Σ and the number of the components of Σ respectively. When $m_s+2g_s\ge 3$ we call the component $(\widetilde{\Sigma}_s;\bar{\mathbf{z}}_s)$ stable. If all components of $(\Sigma;\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ are stable, $(\Sigma;\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is called *a stable curve of genus g and with m marked points.*

Two such genus g semi-stable curves $(\Sigma;z_1,\cdots,z_m)$ and $(\Sigma';z'_1,\cdots,z'_m)$ are said to be isomorphic if there is a homeomorphism $\phi:\Sigma\to\Sigma'$ such that (i) $\phi(z_i)=z'_i, i=1,\cdots,m$, and (ii) the restriction of ϕ to each component Σ_s of it can be lifted to a biholomorphic isomorphism $\phi_{st}:\widetilde{\Sigma}_s\to\widetilde{\Sigma}'_t$. Denote by $[\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]$ the isomorphism class of $(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ and by $Aut(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ the group of all automorphisms of $(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$. Then $(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is stable if and only if $Aut(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a finite group. Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ be the set of all isomorphism classes of stable curves with m marked points and of genus g. It is called the Deligne-Mumford compactifcation of the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{g,m}$ of all isomorphism classes of smooth stable curves with m marked points and of genus g. $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ is not only a projective variety but also complex orbifold of complex dimension $3g-3+m$.

For the above genus g semi-stable curve $(\Sigma;\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ a continuous map $f:\Sigma\to M$ is called C^l-smooth$(l\ge 1)$ if each $f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s}$ is so. The homology class of f is defined by $f_*([\Sigma])=\sum_s(f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s})_*[\Sigma]$. Similarly, for an almost complex structure J on M, a continuous map $f:\Sigma\to M$ is called J-holomorphic if each $f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s}$ is so. Moreover, for fixed $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $p\ge 1$ satisfying $k-\frac{2}{p}\ge 0$ we say a continuous map $f:\Sigma\to M$ to be $L^{k,p}$-map if each $f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s}$ is so.

Definition 2.7([KM]). *Given a genus g semi-stable curve $(\Sigma;\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ with m marked points and J-holomorphic map f from Σ to M a triple $(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is called a* m**-pointed stable** J**-map** *of genus g in M if for each component Σ_s of Σ the composition $f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s}:\widetilde{\Sigma}_s\to M$ cannot be constant map in the case $m_s+2g_s<3$.*

Two such stable maps $(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ and $(f';\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}')$ are called *equivalence* if there is an isomorphism $\phi:(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})\to(\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}')$ such that $f'\circ\phi=f$. Denote $[f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]$ by the equivalence class of $(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$. The automorphism group of $(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is defined by

$$Aut(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})=\{\phi\in Aut(\Sigma,\bar{z})\,|\,f\circ\phi=f\}.$$

Then $Aut(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a finite group. For a given class $A\in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$ let us denote

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$$

by the set of equivalence classes of all m-pointed stable J-maps of genus g and of class A in M. There is a natural stratification of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$, and the number of all stratifications is also finite provided that (M,ω) is compact. If (M,ω) is not compact one cannot guarantee that the number of the natural stratifications is finite. In order to understand it better note that the following result can follow from (2.3) directly.

Proposition 2.8. *For any $[f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$ it holds that*

$$\mathrm{diam}_\mu(f(\Sigma))\le\frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2r_0}\omega(A).$$

Fix $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $p\ge 1$ satisfying $k-\frac{2}{p}\ge 2$. Following [LiuT1, LiuT2, LiuT3] we introduce

Definition 2.9. *Given a genus g semi-stable curve $(\Sigma;\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ with m marked points and a $L^{k,p}$-map f from Σ to M, a triple $(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is called a* m**-pointed stable** $L^{k,p}$**-map** *of genus g in M if for each component Σ_s of Σ satisfying $(f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s})_*([\widetilde{\Sigma}_s])=0\in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$ it holds that $m_s+2g_s\ge 3$.*

Notice that the stable $L^{k,p}$-maps are C^2-smooth under the above assumptions. As above we can define the equivalence class $[f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]$ and the automorphism group $Aut(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ of such a stable $L^{k,p}$-map $(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$. Later, without occurrences of confusions we abbreviate $(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ to $\mathbf{f}$, and $Aut(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ to $Aut(\mathbf{f})$. Consider the disjoint union $\widetilde{\Sigma}:=\cup_s\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$, which is called the normalization of Σ. Denote by $\tilde{f}:=\cup_s f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s}:\widetilde{\Sigma}\to M$. We define the energy of such a stable $L^{k,p}$-map $\mathbf{f}=(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ by

$$E(\mathbf{f})=\frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma|df|^2=\frac{1}{2}\int_{\widetilde{\Sigma}}|d\tilde{f}|^2=\frac{1}{2}\sum_s\int_{\widetilde{\Sigma}_s}|d(f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s})|^2.$$

Here the integral uses a metric τ in the conformal class determined by $j_{\widetilde{\Sigma}}$ and J-Hermitian metric $g_J=\mu$, it is conformally invariant and thus depends only on $j_{\widetilde{\Sigma}}$. It is easily proved that $E(\mathbf{f})$ is independent of choice of representatives in $[\mathbf{f}]$, so we can define $E([\mathbf{f}])=E(\mathbf{f})$. If $\mathbf{f}$ is J-holomorphic then $E(\mathbf{f})=\int_\Sigma f^*\omega=\omega(f_*([\Sigma]))$.

Let $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ be the set of equivalence classes of all m-pointed stable $L^{k,p}$-maps of genus g and of class A in M. Then it is clear that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)\subset\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}.$$

For each $[\mathbf{f}]\in\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ we set

$$\mathcal{E}^M_{A,g,m}=\bigcup_{[\mathbf{f}]\in\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}}\mathcal{E}_{[\mathbf{f}]}\ \text{ and }\ \mathcal{E}_{[\mathbf{f}]}=\Big(\bigcup_{\mathbf{f}\in[\mathbf{f}]}L^p_{k-1}(\wedge^{0,1}(f^*TM))\Big)/\sim.$$

Here the equivalence relation $\sim$ is defined by the pull-back of the sections induced from the identification of the domains. Following [T2] we associate to each stable map $\mathbf{f}=(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ a dual graph $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ as follows. Each irreducible component Σ_s of Σ corresponds to a vertex v_s in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ with weight (g_s,A_s), where g_s is the geometric genus of Σ_s and $A_s=(f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s})([\widetilde{\Sigma}_s])$. For each marked point z_i of Σ_s we attach a leg le_i to v_s. For each intersection point of distinct components Σ_s and Σ_t we attach an edge e_{st} joining v_s and v_t. For each self-intersection point of Σ_s we attach a loop lo_s to v_s. $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$ is independent of the representatives in $[\mathbf{f}]$. We define $\Gamma_{[\mathbf{f}]}=\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$. The genus $g(\Gamma_{[\mathbf{f}]})$ of $\Gamma_{[\mathbf{f}]}$ is defined by the sum of $\sum_s g_s$ and the number of holes in $\Gamma_{[\mathbf{f}]}$. The homology class $A=f_*([\Sigma])=\sum_s A_s$ is defined as that of $\Gamma_{[\mathbf{f}]}$.

A genus g graph Γ with m legs and of homology class A is called *effective* if there is a m-pointed J-holomorphic stable map $\mathbf{f}$ of genus g and of class A in M such that its dual graph $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}} = \Gamma$. For $e > 0$ let $\mathcal{D}^e_{g,m}$ be the set of those effective genus g graphs Γ with m legs and of homology class A satisfying $\omega(A) \le e$.

Following [LiuT1-LiuT3] $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A)$ is equipped with the (weak) topology for which it is also Hausdorff. Notice that Proposition 2.8 implies that for any compact subset $K \subset M$ the images of all maps in

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K) := \{[\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A) \,|\, f(\Sigma) \cap K \neq \emptyset\}$$

is contained in a compact subset of M, $\{x \in M \,|\, d_\mu(x, K) \le 4\omega(A)/(\pi r_0)\}$. We can follow [LiuT1] to prove

Proposition 2.10. *For any compact subset $K \subset M$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K)$ is compact with respect to the weak topology.*

As in [RT1, §4 FO, Prop.8.7] it follows from this result that the following result corresponding to Lemma 3.3 in [Lu1] holds.

Proposition 2.11. *For any compact subset $K \subset M$,*

$$\mathcal{D}^e_{g,m}(K) := \{\Gamma \in \mathcal{D}^e_{g,m} \,|\, \exists\, [\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K) \; s.t. \; \Gamma_{[\mathbf{f}]} = \Gamma\}$$

is finite.

2.4 Strong $L^{k,p}$-topology and local uniformizer

In this subsection we follow the ideas of [LiuT1-LiuT3] to construct the strong $L^{k,p}$-topology and local uniformizers on $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$. We shall give the main steps even if the arguments are the same as there. The reason is that we need to know the size of these local uniformizers when we imitate the methods in [LiuT1, LiuT2, LiuT3] to construct the desired virtual moduli cycles in our case.

2.4.1 Local deformation of a stable curve

We review the local deformation of a stable curve $\sigma \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ in [FO]. Choose a representative $(\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ of σ and let $\Sigma = \cup_s \Sigma_s = \cup_s \pi_{\Sigma_s}(\widetilde{\Sigma}_s)$ be the decomposition of Σ to the irreducible components as in §2.3. Firstly we describe the deformation of σ in the same stratum. Let $V_{deform}(\sigma)$ be a neighborhood of 0 in the product $\prod_s \mathbb{C}^{3g_s - 3 + m_s}$. The universal family induces a fiberwise complex structure on the fiber bundle $V_{deform}(\sigma) \times \Sigma \to V_{deform}(\sigma)$. One may take the following representative. By unique continuation we can consider the direct product $V_{deform}(\sigma) \times \Sigma$ and change the complex structure in a compact set $K_{deform}(\sigma) \subset \Sigma \setminus (Sing(\Sigma) \cup \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ so that it gives a universal family. One can also take a family of Kähler metric which is constant in $\Sigma \setminus K_{deform}(\sigma)$. It can also be assumed that $V_{deform}(\sigma) \times \Sigma$ together with fiberwise complex structure and Kähler metric is equivariant by the diagonal action of $Aut(\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$. These show that for every $u \in V_{deform}$ we have a complex structure j_u on a Kähler metric τ_u satisfying:

(i) $j_u = j_0 = j_\Sigma$ outside $K_{deform}(\sigma) \subset \Sigma \setminus (Sing(\Sigma) \cup \bar{\mathbf{z}})$;

(ii) $\tau_u = \tau_0$ and is flat outside $K_{deform}(\sigma) \subset \Sigma \setminus (Sing(\Sigma) \cup \bar{\mathbf{z}})$;

(iii) j_u and τ_u depend on u smoothly;

(iv) For $\gamma \in Aut(\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ and $u \in V_{deform}(\sigma)$ it holds that $j_{\gamma\cdot u} = \gamma^* j_u$ and $\tau_{\gamma\cdot u} = \gamma^*\tau_u$.

Let us denote Σ^u by Σ equipped with the complex structure j_u and Kähler metric τ_u. Then $\mathcal{U}(\sigma) := \{\sigma_u = [\Sigma^u, \bar{\mathbf{z}}] \,|\, u \in V_{deform}(\sigma)\}$ gives a neighborhood of σ in the same stratum.

Next we construct a parametric representation of a neighborhood of σ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ by gluing. Since $(\Sigma^u, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is equal to $(\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ outside $K_{deform}(\sigma)$ for every $u \in V_{deform}(\sigma)$ and the gluing only occurs near $Sing(\Sigma)$ we only need to consider Σ. Let $V_{resolve}(\sigma)$ be a small neighborhood of the origin in $\prod_{z\in Sing(\Sigma)} T_{z_s}\widetilde{\Sigma}_s \otimes T_{z_t}\widetilde{\Sigma}$. Here $\pi_{\Sigma_s}(z_s) = \pi_{\Sigma_t}(z_t)$ (and $s = t$ is allowed). Near $Sing(\Sigma)$ the Kähler metric $\tau = \tau_0$ induces the Hermitian metrics on $T_{z_s}\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$ and $T_{z_t}\widetilde{\Sigma}_t$ respectively. They in turn induce one on the tensor product $T_{z_s}\widetilde{\Sigma}_s \otimes T_{z_t}\widetilde{\Sigma}_t$. For a vector $v = (v_z) \in V_{resolve}(\sigma)$, if $v_z = 0$ nothing is made. If $v_z \neq 0$ we have a biholomorphism map $\Phi_{v_z} : T_{z_s}\widetilde{\Sigma}_s \setminus \{0\} \to T_{z_t}\widetilde{\Sigma}_t \setminus \{0\}$ such that $w \otimes \Phi_{v_z}(w) = v_z$. Setting $|v_z| = R^{-2}$ then for $|v_z|$ sufficiently small (and thus R sufficiently large) the τ-metric 2-disc $D_{z_s}(3R^{-1/2})$ with center z_s and radius $3R^{-1/2}$ in $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$ and $D_{z_t}(3R^{-1/2})$ with center z_t and radius $3R^{-1/2}$ in $\widetilde{\Sigma}_t$ are contained outside $K_{deform}(\sigma) \cup \bar{\mathbf{z}}$. **Later we assume** $V_{resolve}$ so small that these conclusions hold for all $v \in V_{resolve}$. Using the exponential maps $\exp_{z_s} : T_{z_s}\widetilde{\Sigma}_s \to \widetilde{\Sigma}_s$ and $\exp_{z_t} : T_{z_t}\widetilde{\Sigma}_t \to \widetilde{\Sigma}_t$ with respect to the metric τ we have a biholomorphism

$$\exp_{z_s}^{-1} \circ \Phi_{v_z} \circ \exp_{z_t}^{-1} : D_{z_s}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_s}(R^{-3/2}) \to D_{z_t}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_t}(R^{-3/2}).$$

Clearly, this biholomorphism maps the internal (resp. outer) boundary of the annulus $D_{z_s}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_s}(R^{-3/2})$ to the outer (resp. internal) boundary of the annulus $D_{z_t}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_t}(R^{-3/2})$. Using it we can glue Σ_s and Σ_t. Hereafter we identify $D_{z_s}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_s}(R^{-3/2})$ (resp. $D_{z_t}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_t}(R^{-3/2})$) with $\pi_{\Sigma_s}(D_{z_s}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_s}(R^{-3/2}))$(resp. $\pi_{\Sigma_t}(D_{z_t}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_t}(R^{-3/2}))$). After performing this construction for each nonzero component v_z we obtain a 2-dimensional manifold with possible some points in $Sing(\Sigma)$ as singular points. Then we define a Kähler metric (and thus a complex structure) on this new "manifold". Notice that the construction in [FO] shows that this new metric is only changed on the glue part

$$\cup_{v_z\neq 0} D_{z_s}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_s}(R^{-3/2}) \equiv \cup_{v_z\neq 0} D_{z_t}(R^{-1/2}) \setminus D_{z_t}(R^{-3/2}).$$

Therefore, if we choose the metric τ_u on the other part of this new "manifold" then a new stable curve $(\Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ associated with $(u, v) \in V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{reslove}(\sigma)$ is obtained. Moreover the corresponding complex structure $j_{(u,v)}$ and Kähler metric $\tau_{(u,v)}$ only change on $K_{deform}(\sigma) \cup K_{neck}(\sigma, v)$ and depend on (u, v) smoothly, where

$$K_{neck}(\sigma, v) := \bigcup_{z\in Sing(\Sigma), v_z\neq 0} D_{z_s}(R_z^{-1}) \cup D_{z_t}(R_z^{-1/2}),$$

and $R_z = |v_z|^{-2}$. We get a parametric representation of a neighborhood of σ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ by

$$V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{resolve}(\sigma) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\ (u, v) \mapsto [\Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}]. \tag{2.5}$$

Notice that $(\Sigma_{(u,0)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}) = (\Sigma^u, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ for every $u \in V_{deform}(\sigma)$, and that

$$\begin{aligned} &K_{deform} \cup \bar{\mathbf{z}} \subset \\ &\Sigma_{(u,v)} \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{z\in Sing(\Sigma), v_z\neq 0} D_{z_s}(3R_z^{-1}) \cup D_{z_t}(3R_z^{-1/2}) \bigcup Sing(\Sigma_{(u,v)})\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

for all $(u,v)\in V_{deform}\times V_{resolve}$. It is also clear that $Sing(\Sigma_{(u,v)})\subset Sing(\Sigma)$ for all such (u,v).

2.4.2 Local deformation of a stable J-map

Let $[\mathbf{f}]\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$ and $\mathbf{f}=(f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ be a representative of it. Then $(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ might not be stable. For each unstable components $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$ we add one or two marked point(s) to Σ_s according to whether $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$ contains two or one distinguished point(s). Since $\mathbf{f}$ is stable $f_*([\Sigma_s])\neq 0$ for each unstable component $\widetilde{\Sigma}_s$. So these added points can be required to be the smooth points of Σ, where the differential df is injective. Let $\bar{\mathbf{y}}=\{y_1,\cdots,y_l\}$ be the set of all points added to Σ. Then $\sigma:=(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}\cup\bar{\mathbf{y}})$ is a genus g stable curve with $m+l$ marked points. By (2.5) we have a local deformation of σ:

$$V_{deform}(\sigma)\times V_{resolve}(\sigma)\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m+l},\ (u,v)\mapsto[\Sigma_{(u,v)},\bar{\mathbf{z}}\cup\bar{\mathbf{y}}]. \tag{2.7}$$

Let us define maps $f_{(u,v)}:\Sigma_{(u,v)}\to M$ as follows.

Step 1. For each $u\in V_{deform}(\sigma)$ the above construction shows $\Sigma_{(u,0)}=\Sigma$ as 2-dimensional "manifolds". We define $f_{(u,0)}=f$. However, $f_{(u,0)}:\Sigma_{(u,0)}\to M$ might not be $(j_{(u,0)},J)$-holomorphic.

Step 2. For a vector $v=(v_z)\in V_{resolve}(\sigma)$, if $v_z\neq 0$ for some $z\in Sing(\Sigma)$, we assume $|v|$ so small that $\pi_{\Sigma_s}(D_{z_s}(3R_z^{-1/2}))\cup\pi_{\Sigma_t}(3D_{z_t}(R_z^{-1/2}))$ is contained in $\Sigma\setminus K_{deform}(\sigma)$ where $\tau_{(u,v)}=\tau$ is flat. Here $R_z=|v_z|^{-1/2}$. Let

$$f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_s}(x)=\exp_{f(z)}(\xi_s(x)),\ \text{if } x\in D_{z_s}(3R_z^{-1/2}),$$
$$f\circ\pi_{\Sigma_t}(x)=\exp_{f(z)}(\xi_t(x)),\ \text{if } x\in D_{z_t}(3R_z^{-1/2}),$$

where $\xi_s(x),\xi_t(x)\in T_{f(z)}M$. Take a smooth cut function $\chi:\mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ such that

$$\chi(r)=\begin{cases}0 & \text{as } r\le 1\\ 1 & \text{as } r\ge 4\end{cases},\ 0\le\chi'(r)\le 1.$$

Denote by $\chi_{v_z}(r)=\chi(R_z r)$ for all $r\ge 0$.

- If $x\in\pi_{\Sigma_s}(D_{z_s}(2R_z^{-1/2})\setminus D_{z_s}(R_z^{-1/2}))=\pi_{\Sigma_s}(D_{z_s}(2R_z^{-1/2}))\setminus\pi_{\Sigma_s}(D_{z_s}(R_z^{-1/2}))$ we define
$$f_{(u,v)}(x)=\exp_{f(z)}[\chi_{v_z}(|\exp^{-1}_{z_s}(\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_s}(x))|^2\xi_s(x)].$$

- If $x\in\pi_{\Sigma_t}(D_{z_t}(2R_z^{-1/2})\setminus D_{z_t}(R_z^{-1/2}))=\pi_{\Sigma_t}(D_{z_t}(2R_z^{-1/2}))\setminus\pi_{\Sigma_t}(D_{z_t}(R_z^{-1/2}))$ we define
$$f_{(u,v)}(x)=\exp_{f(z)}[\chi_{v_z}(|\exp^{-1}_{z_t}(\pi^{-1}_{\Sigma_t}(x))|^2\xi_t(x)].$$

- If x belongs to the glue part
$$\pi_{\Sigma_s}(D_{z_s}(R^{-1/2})\setminus D_{z_s}(R^{-3/2}))\equiv\pi_{\Sigma_t}(D_{z_t}(R^{-1/2})\setminus D_{z_t}(R^{-3/2})),$$
we define $f_{(u,v)}(x)=f(z)$.

Near other singular points we make similar definitions. If $x \in \Sigma_{(u,v)}$ is not in

$$\cup_{v_z \neq 0}(\pi_{\Sigma_s}(D_{z_s}(2R_z^{-1/2})) \cup \pi_{\Sigma_t}(D_{z_t}(2R_z^{-1/2})))$$

we define $f_{(u,v)}(x) = f(x)$. Clearly, $f_{(u,v)} : \Sigma_{(u,v)} \to M$ is smooth in the sense of §2.4. It should be noted that the above definition of $f_{(u,v)}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(f_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)}), f(\Sigma)) := & \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{(u,v)}} \inf_{y \in \Sigma} d_M(f_{(u,v)}(x), f(y)) \\ \leq & \; 2 \max_{v_z \neq 0} R_z^{-1/2} \\ = & \; 2 \max_{v_z \neq 0} |v_z|^{1/4} \leq 2|v|^{1/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where d_M is a fixed Riemannian distance on M. It follows that

$$\mathrm{diam}_\mu(f_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)})) \leq \mathrm{diam}_\mu(f(\Sigma)) + 4|v|^{1/4} \quad \text{and} \tag{2.8}$$

$$f_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)})) \subset \{q \in M \mid d_\mu(q, f(\Sigma)) \leq 4|v|^{1/4}\} \tag{2.9}$$

for every $(u, v) \in V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{resolve}(\sigma)$.

Remark 2.12. For $[\mathbf{f}] = [(f; \Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A)$ and $\sigma = (\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ as above, since $V_{deform}(\sigma)$ (resp. $V_{resolve}(\sigma)$) is a neighborhood of the origin in the vector space $\prod_s \mathbb{C}^{3g_s-3+m_s+l_s}$ (resp. $\prod_{z \in Sing(\Sigma)} T_{z_s}\widetilde{\Sigma}_s \otimes T_{z_t}\widetilde{\Sigma}_t$) we can fix a $\delta_{\mathbf{f}} > 0$ such that the open ball $V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}}$ with center 0 and radius $\delta_{\mathbf{f}}$ in the product space $\prod_s \mathbb{C}^{3g_s-3+m_s+l_s} \times \prod_{z \in Sing(\Sigma)} T_{z_s}\widetilde{\Sigma}_s \otimes T_{z_t}\widetilde{\Sigma}_t$ is contained in $V_{deform}(\sigma) \times V_{resolve}(\sigma)$. Moreover, (2.6) also implies

$$f_{(u,v)}(z_j) = f(z_j) \quad \forall z_j \in \bar{\mathbf{z}}. \tag{2.10}$$

Furthermore we require $\delta_{\mathbf{f}} > 0$ so small that each $\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)} = (f_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a stable $L^{k,p}$-map and has the homology class A and the energy

$$E(\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)}) \leq \omega(A) + 1 \tag{2.11}$$

since $E(\mathbf{f}) = \omega(A)$.

2.4.3 Strong $L^{k,p}$-topology

For $\epsilon > 0$ we denote

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\epsilon(\delta_{\mathbf{f}})$$

by the set of all tuples $(g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$(u, v) \in V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}}; \tag{2.12}$$

$$g_{(u,v)} : \Sigma_{(u,v)} \to M \text{ is a } L^{k,p} - \text{map}; \tag{2.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|g_{(u,v)} - f_{(u,v)}\|_{k,p} < \epsilon, \text{ where the norm } \|\cdot\|_{k,p} \text{ is measured with respect to the} \\ &\text{metrics } \tau_{(u,v)} \text{ and } g_J = \mu. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Note that our choices of (k,p) ensure that the norm $\|\cdot\|_{k,p}$ is stronger than C^2-topology. Therefore if $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough then each $\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} = (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is a stable $L^{k,p}$-map and has also the homology class A and the energy

$$E(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}) \le \omega(A) + 2 \tag{2.15}$$

because of (2.11). By making $\delta_{\mathbf{f}} > 0$ smaller we can assume that these hold for all $0 < \epsilon \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}$. Moreover it follows from (2.8) and (2.14) above that

$$\max_{(u,v)\in V_{\mathbf{f}}} \mathrm{diam}_\mu(g_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)})) \le \mathrm{diam}_\mu(f(\Sigma)) + 4\delta_{\mathbf{f}}^{1/4} + 2\epsilon$$

for $(u,v) \in V_{\mathbf{f}}$. We can also assume that $0 < \epsilon \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}} < 1$. Then (2.9) and (2.14) imply

$$\bigcup_{(u,v)\in V_{\mathbf{f}}} g_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)}) \subset \{q \in M \,|\, d_\mu(q, f(\Sigma)) \le 6\}. \tag{2.16}$$

For each $0 < \delta \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}$ we denote by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}) := \{(g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\delta_{\mathbf{f}}) \,|\, (u,v) \in V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}},\ |(u,v)| < \delta\}.$$

Remark that the above constructions still hold for any $[\mathbf{f}] \in \mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A}$. Let

$$\mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{f}) := \{[g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}] \,|\, (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f})\} \subset \mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A}$$

and $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{f}) \,|\, \mathbf{f} \in [\mathbf{f}] \in \mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A},\ 0 < \delta \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}\}$. As in [LiuT1] we can prove

Proposition 2.13. *$\mathcal{U}$ generates a topology, called the (strong) $L^{k,p}$-topology, on $\mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A}$. The topology is equivalent to the weak topology on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$.*

Since $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K)$ is compact with respect to the weak topology for any compact subset $K \subset M$ we get

Corollary 2.14. *There is an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$ in $\mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A}$ such that $\mathcal{W}$ is Hausdorff with respect to the $L^{k,p}$-topology.*

2.4.4 Local uniformizers

Let $\mathbf{f}$ be as in §2.4.2. For each $y_j \in \bar{\mathbf{y}}$ we choose a codimension two small open disc $H_j \subset M$ such that (i) H_j intersects $f(\Sigma)$ uniquely and transversely at $f(y_j)$, (ii) $f^{-1}(H_j) = f^{-1}(f(y_j))$, and (iii) H_j is oriented so that it has positive intersection with $f(\Sigma)$. Let $\mathrm{H} = \prod_j H_j$ and

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) := \{(g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}) \,|\, g_{(u,v)}(y_j) \in H_j\ \forall y_j \in \bar{\mathbf{y}}\}$$

for $0 < \delta \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}$. Slightly modifying the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [LiuT2] we have

Proposition 2.15. *For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small there exists a continuous right action of $Aut(\mathbf{f})$ on $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})$ that is smooth on each open stratum of $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})$. Moreover this action also commutes with the projection*

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) \to \mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) \subset \mathcal{B}^M_{g,m,A},\ (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \mapsto [g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}],$$

and the induced quotient map $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})/Aut(\mathbf{f}) \to \mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})$ is a homomorphism. Here $\mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) := \{[g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}] \,|\, (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})\}$.

By making $\delta_{\mathbf{f}}$ smaller we later always assume that Proposition 2.15 holds for all $0 < \delta \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}$.

3 Virtual moduli cycles

In this section we shall follow the ideas in [LiuT1-3] to construct the virtual moduli cycle. For this goal we give the necessary reviews of the arguments in [LiuT1-3] and different points.

3.1 The local construction

There is a natural stratified Banach bundle $\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ whose fiber $\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}$ at $\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} = (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ is given by $L^p_{k-1}(\wedge^{0,1}(g^*_{(u,v)}TM))$. Here $\wedge^{0,1}(g^*_{(u,v)}TM)$ is the bundle of $(0,1)$-forms on $\Sigma_{(u,v)}$ with respect to the complex structure $j_{(u,v)}$ on $\Sigma_{(u,v)}$ and the almost complex structure J on M, and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{k-1,p}$ in $L^p_{k-1}(\wedge^{0,1}(g^*_{(u,v)}TM))$ is with respect to the metric $\tau_{(u,v)}$ on $\Sigma_{(u,v)}$ and the metric μ (or g_J) on M. The action of $Aut(\mathbf{f})$ on $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ can be lifted to a linear action on $\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}$ such that the natural projection $\tilde{p}_{\mathbf{f}} : \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ is a $Aut(\mathbf{f})$-equivariant and locally trivial vector bundle when restricted over each stratum of $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$. Moreover there is a local orbifold bundle $\mathbf{E}_\delta([\mathbf{f}]) \to \mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ with $\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ as the local uniformizer. That is, $\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})/Aut(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbf{E}_\delta([\mathbf{f}])$. The fiber $\mathbf{E}_\delta([\mathbf{f}])_{[\mathbf{h}]}$ at $[\mathbf{h}] \in \mathbf{U}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ consists of all elements of $L^p_{k-1}(\wedge^{0,1}(h^*TM))$ modulo equivalence relation defined via pull-back of sections induced by the equivalences of the domains of different representatives of $[\mathbf{h}]$. Consider the section

$$\bar{\partial}_J : \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}),\ \mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \mapsto \bar{\partial}_J g_{(u,v)}. \tag{3.1}$$

As in [LiuT2, §5.1] we choose the previous each open disk H_j to be totally geodesic with respect to the metric g_J so that the tangent space of $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ at $\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} = (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}})$, denoted by $T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$, is equal to

$$L^{k,p}(g^*_{(u,v)}TM, T_{\mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})}\mathrm{H}) := \{\xi \,|\, \xi \in L^{k,p}(g^*_{(u,v)}TM),\ \xi(y_j) \in T_{y_j}H_j\ \forall y_j \in \bar{\mathbf{y}}\}.$$

For $(u,v) \in \Lambda_\delta(\mathbf{f}) = \{(u,v) \in V_{\delta_{\mathbf{f}}} \,|\, |(u,v)| < \delta\}$ let

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) := \{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})\} \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) := \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})|_{\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})}.$$

Following [LiuT1-2] one has the trivialization of $\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$,

$$\psi^{(u,v)} : \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) \times L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) \tag{3.2}$$

obtained by the J-invariant parallel transformation of (M,J). Under the trivialization the restriction of the section $\bar{\partial}_J$ in (3.1) to $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ has the following representative,

$$F_{(u,v)} = \pi_2 \circ (\psi^{(u,v)})^{-1} \circ \bar{\partial}_J : \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(u,v)}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H}) \to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM). \tag{3.3}$$

Since the vertical differential

$$D\bar{\partial}_J(\mathbf{f}) : L^{k,p}(f^*TM, T_{\mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})}\mathrm{H}) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{f}}$$

is a Fredholm operator its cokernel $R(\mathbf{f}) \subset \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{f}}$ is finite dimensional. So

$$(D\bar{\partial}_J(\mathbf{f})) \oplus I_{\mathbf{f}} : (T_{\mathbf{f}}\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})) \oplus R(\mathbf{f}) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_\delta(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{f}}$$

is surjective, where $I_{\mathbf{f}}$ denotes the inclusion $R(\mathbf{f}) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\delta}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{f}}$. Note that $Aut_{\mathbf{f}}$ is a finite group. $\sum_{\sigma \in Aut_{\mathbf{f}}} \sigma(R(\mathbf{f}))$ is still finite dimensional and $Aut_{\mathbf{f}}$ acts on it. By slightly perturbing $\sum_{\sigma \in Aut_{\mathbf{f}}} \sigma(R(\mathbf{f}))$ we can assume that $Aut_{\mathbf{f}}$ acts on it freely. *We still denote $R(\mathbf{f})$ by this perturbation below.* Take a smooth cut-off function $\gamma_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{f})$ supported outside of the ϵ-neighborhood of double points of $\Sigma_{(0,0)} = \Sigma$ for a small $\epsilon > 0$, and denote by $R_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) = \{\gamma_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) \cdot \xi \,|\, \xi \in R(\mathbf{f})\}$. Let us still use $I_{\mathbf{f}}$ to denote the inclusion $R_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\delta}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{f}}$. It was proved in [LiuT1] that there exists a sufficiently small $\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}} > 0$ such that

$$L_{\mathbf{f}} := (D\bar{\partial}_J(\mathbf{f})) \oplus I_{\mathbf{f}} : (T_{\mathbf{f}}\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})) \oplus R_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{f}) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\delta}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})_{\mathbf{f}} \tag{3.4}$$

is still surjective for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}]$. We may require $\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}} > 0$ so small that the $\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}$-neighborhood of double points of Σ, denoted by $\mathcal{N}(Sing(\Sigma), \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$, is not intersecting with $K_{deform}(\sigma)$. *Now we take $0 < \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}) \le \delta_{\mathbf{f}}$ so small that when $|(u,v)| \le \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ our construction for $(f_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)})$ in §2.4.2 only need to change f and Σ in the $\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}/2$-neighborhood of double points of Σ.* Let $\mathcal{N}(u, v; \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ be a part of $\Sigma_{(u,v)}$ which is obtained after resolving the double points of Σ in $\mathcal{N}(Sing(\Sigma), \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ with gluing parameters v, and such that

$$\Sigma_{(u,v)} \setminus \mathcal{N}(u, v; \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}) = \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{N}(Sing(\Sigma), \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}) \tag{3.5}$$

as manifolds. Since $\nu \equiv 0$ in $\mathcal{N}(Sing(\Sigma), \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ each $\nu \in R_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}}(\mathbf{f})$ can determine a unique element $\nu(\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)})$ of $L^p_{k-1}(\wedge^{0,1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM))$ for all deformation parameters (u,v) satisfying $|(u,v)| \le \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$.

$$\nu(\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)})(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\nu(z) + J(f(z)) \circ \nu(z) \circ j_{(u,v)}) & \text{if } z \in \Sigma_{(u,v)} \setminus \mathcal{N}(u, v; \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}), \\ 0 & \text{if } z \in \mathcal{N}(u, v; \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}). \end{cases}$$

Here $j_{(u,v)}$ is the complex structure on $\Sigma_{(u,v)}$ obtained in §2.4.1. It is clear that

$$\nu(\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)}) = \nu(\mathbf{f}_{(u,0)}) \quad \text{on} \quad \Sigma_{(u,v)} \setminus \mathcal{N}(u, v; \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}) = \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{N}(Sing(\Sigma), \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$$

for any $|(u,v)| \le \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$. For each $\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} = (g_{(u,v)}, \Sigma_{(u,v)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}} \cup \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f})$, using the J-invariant parallel transformation of (M, J) we get a unique element $\nu(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}) \in L^p_{k-1}(\wedge^{0,1}(g^*_{(u,v)}TM))$ from $\nu(\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)})$, which also satisfies:

$$\nu(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(z) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathcal{N}(u, v; \epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}). \tag{3.6}$$

This gives rise to a section

$$\tilde{\nu} : \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) \to \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}),\ \mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \mapsto \nu(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}), \tag{3.7}$$

which is continuous and stratawise smooth. Clearly, $\tilde{\nu} = 0$ as $\nu = 0$. If $\nu \ne 0$ and $\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}) > 0$ sufficiently small then $\tilde{\nu}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}) \ne 0$ for all $|(u,v)| \le \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$, i.e., $\tilde{\nu}$ is not equal to the zero at any point of $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})$. Take a basis $(\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_q)$ of $R_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}}(\mathbf{f})$. We require each ν_j so close to the origin of $R_{\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}}(\mathbf{f})$ that

$$\sup\{\|\tilde{\nu}_j(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})\| \,:\, \mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \in \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})\} \le 1 \tag{3.8}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, q$. For convenience we denote by

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}} := \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) & \quad\text{and}\quad & W_{\mathbf{f}} := \mathbf{U}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) = \pi_{\mathbf{f}}(\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}), \\ \widetilde{E}_{\mathbf{f}} := \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) & \quad\text{and}\quad & E_{\mathbf{f}} := \mathbf{E}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}). \end{array}$$

Take a $Aut(\mathbf{f})$-invariant, continuous and stratawise smooth cut-off function $\beta_{\mathbf{f}}$ on $\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}$ such that it is equal to 1 near $\mathbf{f}$ and that

$$\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}} := \{x \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}} \mid \beta_{\mathbf{f}}(x) > 0\} \subset\subset \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}. \tag{3.9}$$

Hereafter the notation $A \subset\subset B$ denotes that the closure $Cl(A)$ of A is contained in B. Let $U^0_{\mathbf{f}} = \pi_{\mathbf{f}}(\widetilde{U}_0)$,

$$\widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}} := \mathrm{Int}(\{x \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}} \mid \beta_{\mathbf{f}}(x) = 1\}). \tag{3.10}$$

and $V^0_{\mathbf{f}} = \pi_{\mathbf{f}}(\widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}})$. Then $\widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}} = (\pi_{\mathbf{f}})^{-1}(V^0_{\mathbf{f}})$, and it is also a $Aut(\mathbf{f})$-invariant open neighborhood of $\mathbf{f}$ in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}$. Let

$$\tilde{s}_j = \beta_{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \tilde{\nu}_j,\ j = 1, \cdots, q. \tag{3.11}$$

Each $\tilde{s}_j$ is a stratawise smooth section of the bundle $\widetilde{E}_{\mathbf{f}} \to \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}$, and for $j = 1, \cdots, q$,

$$\{\mathbf{h} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}} \,|\, \tilde{s}_j(\mathbf{h}) \neq 0\} = \widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup\{\|\tilde{s}_j(\mathbf{h})\| \,:\, \mathbf{h} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}\} \le 1. \tag{3.12}$$

Here the second claim follows from (3.8). For any $|(u,v)| \le \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ let $\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(u,v)}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H})$ and

$$s^{(u,v)}_j : \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}} \to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM) \tag{3.13}$$

be the representative of the restriction of the section $\tilde{s}_j$ to $\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}}$ under the trivialization in (3.2), $j = 1, \cdots, q$. It is easily checked that for $j = 1, \cdots, q$,

$$\begin{aligned} &s^{(u,v)}_j(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}) = \beta_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}) \cdot \nu_j(\mathbf{f}_{(u,v)}),\ \text{and thus} \\ &ds^{(u,v)}_j(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}) = 0 \ \big(T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}} \to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM)\big) \text{ if } \mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \in \widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Moreover, since $Z(\bar\partial_J) \cap Cl(\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}})$ is a compact subset in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}$ there exists a constant $c(\beta_{\mathbf{f}}) > 0$ only depending on $\beta_{\mathbf{f}}$ and an open neighborhood $\mathcal{N}\big(Z(\bar\partial_J) \cap Cl(\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}})\big)$ of it in $\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}$ such that

$$\|ds^{(u,v)}_j(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})\| \le c(\beta_{\mathbf{f}})\ \forall \mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \in \mathcal{N}\big(Z(\bar\partial_J) \cap Cl(\widetilde{U}_{\mathbf{f}})\big) \cap \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}} \tag{3.15}$$

for $|(u,v)| < \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ if $\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}) > 0$ is small enough. Here $Z(\bar\partial_J)$ is the zero set of the section $\bar\partial_J : \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}} \to \widetilde{E}_{\mathbf{f}}$. Note that the map $L_{\mathbf{f}}$ in (3.4) being surjective is equivalent to that the map

$$\begin{aligned} &T_{\mathbf{f}}\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}^{(0,0)}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f}, \mathrm{H}) \times \mathbb{R}^q \to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(0,0)}TM), \\ &(\xi; t_1, \cdots, t_q) \mapsto dF_{(0,0)}(\mathbf{f})(\xi) + \sum_{j=1}^q t_j\nu_j \end{aligned}$$

is surjective. By refining the gluing arguments in [McSa1] and [Liu] the following result was proved in [LiuT1] .

Lemma 3.1. *For sufficiently small* $\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}}) > 0$, $|(u,v)| \le \delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ *and* $\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \in \widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}} \cap \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}}$ *the map*

$$\begin{aligned} &T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}(\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}} \cap \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}}) \times \mathbb{R}^q \to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM), \\ &(\xi; e_1, \cdots, e_q) \mapsto dF_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi) + \sum_{j=1}^q e_j s^{(u,v)}_j(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}), \end{aligned}$$

is surjective. In particular the map

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\times\mathbb{R}^q\to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM),\\&(\xi;e_1,\cdots,e_q)\mapsto dF_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)+\sum_{j=1}^q e_js_j^{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})\end{aligned}$$

is surjective since $T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}(\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\cap\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}})\subset T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}$*.*

For $\eta>0$ let Π_1 be the projection to the first factor of $\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\times\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$. Consider the sections

$$\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f})}:\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\times B_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)\to\Pi_1^*\widetilde{E}_{\mathbf{f}},\ (\mathbf{h},\mathbf{t})\mapsto\bar{\partial}_J(h)+\sum_{j=1}^q t_j\tilde{s}_j(\mathbf{h}),$$

and $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f})}_{\mathbf{t}}=\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f})}(\cdot,\mathbf{t}):\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\to\widetilde{E}_{\mathbf{f}}$ for $\mathbf{t}=(t_1,\cdots,t_q)\in\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$. Clearly, they are the continuous and stratawise smooth. For any $|(u,v)|\le\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})$ let $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f};u,v)}$ be the restriction of $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f})}$ to $(\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\cap\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}})\times\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$. As in (3.3), under the trivialization in (3.2) $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f};u,v)}$ has the representation

$$\begin{aligned}&\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\cap\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}}\times\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)\to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM),\\&(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)},\mathbf{t})\mapsto F_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})+\sum_{j=1}^q e_js_j^{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}).\end{aligned}$$

Its tangent map at $(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)},\mathbf{t})\in\widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\cap\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}}\times\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ is exactly given by

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}(\widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\cap\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}})\times\mathbb{R}^q\to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM),\\&(\xi;e_1,\cdots,e_q)\mapsto dF_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)+\sum_{j=1}^q\big(e_js_j^{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})+t_jds_j^{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)\big)\\&\qquad\qquad\qquad=dF_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)+\sum_{j=1}^q e_js_j^{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}).\end{aligned}$$

Here the final equality is because of (3.14). By Lemma 3.1 it is surjective. For any given open subset $\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}\subset\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}$ with $\widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\subset\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}\subset\subset\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}$, it follows from this and (3.6) that if $\eta>0$ is small enough the map

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}\times\mathbb{R}^q\to L^p_{k-1}(f^*_{(u,v)}TM),\\&(\xi;e_1,\cdots,e_q)\mapsto dF_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)+\sum_{j=1}^q\big(e_js_j^{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})+t_jds_j^{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)\big)\end{aligned}$$

is surjective for $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$. So we get immediately

Proposition 3.2. *For any given open subset* $\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}\subset\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}$ *with* $\widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}}\subset\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}\subset\subset\widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}}$*, there exists a sufficiently small* $\eta=\eta_{\mathbf{f}}>0$ *such that the restriction of* $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f})}$ *to each stratum of* $\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}\times\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *is transversal to the zero section. So there exists a residual subset* $\mathbf{B}^{res}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *in* $\mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *such that for each* $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *the restriction of the section* $\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f})}_{\mathbf{t}}:\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}\to\widetilde{E}_{\mathbf{f}}$ *to each stratum of* $\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}$ *is* *transversal to the zero section. Consequently, for each* $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\eta}(\mathbb{R}^q)$*,* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{f})^{\mathbf{t}} := (\Upsilon^{(\mathbf{f})}_{\mathbf{t}}|_{\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}})^{-1}(0)$ *is a stratified and cornered manifold in* $\widetilde{V}^{0+}_{\mathbf{f}}$ *that has the (even) dimension given by the Index Theorem on all of its strata. Moreover, any two different* $\mathbf{t}_0, \mathbf{t}_1 \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\eta}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *give cobordant stratified and cornered manifolds* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{f})^{\mathbf{t}_0}$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{f})^{\mathbf{t}_1}$*.*

3.2 The global construction

The main ideas still follow [LiuT1-3]. But we need to be more careful and must give suitable modifications for their arguments because our $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$ is not compact.

For any $[\mathbf{f}] = [f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$, let $\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\delta(\epsilon_{\mathbf{f}})}(\mathbf{f},\mathrm{H})$ as above. By (2.16),

$$\bigcup_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}} g_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)}) \subset \{y \in M \,|\, d_\mu(y, f(\Sigma)) \le 6\}. \tag{3.16}$$

Fix a compact subset $K_0 \subset M$, and denote by

$$K_j := \{y \in M \,|\, d_\mu(y, K_0) \le jC\},\ j = 1, 2, \cdots, \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$C = C(\alpha_0, \beta_0, C_0, i(M,\mu)) = 6 + \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}\omega(A). \tag{3.18}$$

It easily follows from Proposition 2.8 and (3.16) that

$$\bigcup_{[\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_j)} \ \bigcup_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)} \in \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}} g_{(u,v)}(\Sigma_{(u,v)}) \subset K_{j+1} \tag{3.19}$$

for any $j = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Since each $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_j)$ is compact we can choose

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{f}^{(i)} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_0),\ i = 1, \cdots, n_0, \quad \text{and}\\
&\mathbf{f}^{(i)} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_{j+1}) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_j),\ i = n_j + 1, \cdots, n_{j+1},
\end{aligned}$$

$j = 0, 1, 2$, such that the corresponding $V^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}$ as in (3.10) and $W_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}$ satisfy

$$\cup_{i=1}^{n_j} V^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}} \supset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \cup_{i=1}^{n_0} W_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}} = \emptyset \tag{3.20}$$

for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. The second requirement is needed later and can always be satisfied because we may add two disjoint open subsets to $W_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}$, $i = 1, \cdots, n_0$.

Abbreviation Notations: For $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_3$, we abbreviate

$$\begin{array}{llll}
\widetilde{W}_i = \widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}, & W_i = W_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}, & \widetilde{E}_i = \widetilde{E}_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}, & E_i := E_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}},\\
\widetilde{U}^0_i = \widetilde{U}^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}, & U^0_i = U^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}, & \widetilde{V}^0_i = \widetilde{V}^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}, & V^0_i := V^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}},\\
\pi_i = \pi_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}, & \Gamma_i = Aut(\mathbf{f}^{(i)}), & \eta_i := \eta_{\mathbf{f}^{(\mathbf{i})}}, & \beta_i = \beta_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}},\\
\delta_i = \delta(\epsilon^{(i)}_{\mathbf{f}}). & & &
\end{array}$$

As in (3.11), for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n_3$ let $\tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j = 1, \cdots, q_i$, be the corresponding sections of the bundle $\widetilde{E}_i \to \widetilde{W}_i$ such that

$$\{\mathbf{h} \in \widetilde{W}_i \,|\, \tilde{s}_{ij}(\mathbf{h}) \ne 0\} = \widetilde{U}^0_i, \quad \sup\{\|\tilde{s}_{ij}(\mathbf{h})\| : \mathbf{h} \in \widetilde{W}_i\} \le 1, \tag{3.21}$$

and that the corresponding conclusions with those in Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 hold, i.e.,

Lemma 3.3. *For any* $|(u,v)|\le\delta_i$ *and* $\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}\in\widetilde{U}^0_i\cap\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_i$ *the map*

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}(\widetilde{U}^0_i\cap\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_i)\times\mathbb{R}^{q_i}\to L^p_{k-1}(f^{(i)*}_{(u,v)}TM),\\&(\xi;e_1,\cdots,e_{q_i})\mapsto dF^{(i)}_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{q_i}e_js^{(u,v)}_{ij}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}\widetilde{U}^0_i\times\mathbb{R}^{q_i}\to L^p_{k-1}(f^{(i)*}_{(u,v)}TM),\\&(\xi;e_1,\cdots,e_{q_i})\mapsto dF^{(i)}_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{q_i}e_js^{(u,v)}_{ij}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})\end{aligned}$$

is surjective, $i=1,\cdots,n_3$*, where*

$$F^{(i)}_{(u,v)},\ s^{(u,v)}_{ij}:\widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}\to L^p_{k-1}(f^{(i)*}_{(u,v)}TM),\ j=1,\cdots,q_i,$$

are the representatives of the sections $\bar\partial_J,\tilde{s}_{ij}:\widetilde{W}_i\to\widetilde{E}_i$ *under the trivialization as in (3.2). Moreover, for any given open subset* $\widetilde{V}^{0+}_i\subset\widetilde{U}^0_i$ *with* $\widetilde{V}^0_i\subset\widetilde{V}^{0+}_i\subset\subset\widetilde{U}^0_i$*, there exists a sufficiently small* $\eta_i>0$ *such that for any* $|(u,v)|\le\delta_i$*,* $\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}\in\widetilde{V}^0_i$ *and* $(t_{i1},\cdots,t_{iq_i})\in\mathbf{B}_{\eta_i}(\mathbb{R}^{q_i})$ *the maps*

$$\begin{aligned}&T_{\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)}}\widetilde{V}^{0+}_i\times\mathbb{R}^{q_i}\to L^p_{k-1}(f^{(i)*}_{(u,v)}TM),\\&(\xi;e_1,\cdots,e_{q_i})\mapsto dF^{(i)}_{(u,v)}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{q_i}\big(e_is^{(u,v)}_{ij}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})+t_{ij}ds^{(u,v)}_{ij}(\mathbf{g}_{(u,v)})(\xi)\big)\end{aligned}$$

is surjective, $i=1,\cdots,n_3$.

Denote by

$$\mathcal{W}:=\cup_{i=1}^{n_3}W_i\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{E}:=\mathcal{E}^M_{A,g,m}|_{\mathcal{W}}.$$

The proof of Lemma 4.2 in [LiuT1] or that of Theorem 3.4 in [LiuT2] showed:

Lemma 3.4. $\mathcal{W}$ *is a stratified orbifold and* $\mathcal{E}\to\mathcal{W}$ *is a stratified orbifold bundle with respect to the above local uniformizers.*

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all finite subsets $I=\{i_1,\cdots,i_l\}$ of $\{1,\cdots,n_3\}$ such that the intersection $W_I:=\cap_{i\in I}W_i$ is nonempty and that $i_1<i_2<\cdots<i_k$ if $k>1$. Then each $I\in\mathcal{N}$ has the length $|I|=\sharp(I)<n_3$ because of the second condition in (3.20). Define $E_I:=\mathcal{E}|_{W_I}$. For each $I\in\mathcal{N}$ denote by the group $\Gamma_I:=\prod_{i\in I}\Gamma_i$ and the fiber product

$$\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}=\Big\{(u_i)_{i\in I}\in\prod_{i\in I}\widetilde{W}_i\ \Big|\ \pi_i(u_i)=\pi_j(u_j)\ \forall i,j\in I\Big\}$$

equipped with the induced topology from $\prod_{l=1}^k\widetilde{W}_{i_l}$. Then the obvious projection $\tilde\pi_I:\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}\to W_I$ has covering group Γ_I whose action on $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ is given by

$$\phi_I\cdot(\tilde{u}_i)_{i\in I}=(\phi_i\cdot\tilde{u}_i)_{i\in I},\quad\forall\phi_I=(\phi_i)_{i\in I}\in\Gamma_I.\tag{3.22}$$

(Hereafter we often write $(\tilde{v}_{i_1},\cdots,\tilde{v}_{i_k})$ as $(\tilde{v}_i)_{i\in I}$.) Namely, $\tilde\pi_I$ induces a homomorphism from $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}/\Gamma_I$ onto W_I. Moreover, for $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$ there are projections

$$\tilde\pi^I_J:\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}\to\widetilde{W}_J^{\Gamma_J},\ \ (\tilde{u}_i)_{i\in I}\mapsto(\tilde{u}_j)_{j\in J},\tag{3.23}$$

and $\lambda^I_J : \Gamma_I \to \Gamma_J$ given by $(\phi_i)_{i\in I} \mapsto (\phi_j)_{j\in J}$. Later we also write λ^I_J as λ^i_J if $I = \{i\}$. Note that π^I_J is not surjective in general. Repeating the same construction from $\widetilde{E}_i$ one obtains the bundles $\tilde{p}_I : \widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ and the projections $\widetilde{\Pi}_I : \widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to E_I$ and $\widetilde{\Pi}^I_J : \widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_J}_J$ as $J \subset I$. Their properties may be summarized as:

Lemma 3.5. (i) *$\tilde{\pi}_J \circ \tilde{\pi}^I_J = \iota^W_{IJ} \circ \tilde{\pi}_I$ and $\widetilde{\Pi}_J \circ \widetilde{\Pi}^I_J = \iota^E_{IJ} \circ \widetilde{\Pi}_I$ for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ and the inclusions $\iota^W_{IJ} : W_I \hookrightarrow W_J$, $\iota^E_{IJ} : E_I \hookrightarrow E_J$.*

(ii) *$\tilde{\pi}^I_J \circ \phi_I = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) \circ \tilde{\pi}^I_J$ and $\widetilde{\Pi}^I_J \circ \phi_I = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) \circ \widetilde{\Pi}^I_J$ for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ and $\phi_I \in \Gamma_I$.*

(ii) *The obvious projection $\tilde{p}_I : \widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ is equivariant with respect to the induced actions of Γ_I on them, i.e. $\tilde{p}_I \circ \psi_I = \psi_I \circ \tilde{p}_I$ for any $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$.*

(iii) *$\tilde{\pi}_I \circ \tilde{p}_I = p \circ \widetilde{\Pi}_I$ $\forall \phi_I \in \Gamma_I$, and $\tilde{\pi}^I_J \circ \tilde{p}_I = \tilde{p}_J \circ \widetilde{\Pi}^I_J$ for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$.*

(iv) *The generic fiber of both $\tilde{\pi}^I_J$ and $\widetilde{\Pi}^I_J$ contains $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$ points.*

Therefore we get a system of bundles

$$(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^\Gamma, \widetilde{W}^\Gamma) = \Big\{ (\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I, \widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I), \tilde{\pi}_I, \widetilde{\Pi}_I, \Gamma_I, \tilde{\pi}^I_J, \widetilde{\Pi}^I_J, \lambda^I_J \;\Big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N} \Big\}.$$

Note that as proved by Liu-Tian each $(\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I, \widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I)$ is only a pair of stratified Banach varieties in the sense that locally they are finite union of stratified Banach manifolds. For reader's convenience let us explain in details the arguments in terms of the concept of "local component" in [LiuT3]. A continuous map from a stratified manifold to another is called a *partially smooth* (*abbreviated as* PS) if it restricts to a smooth map on each stratum. Similarly, in the partial smooth category one has the notions of the PS diffeomorphism, PS embedding and PS bundle map (resp. isomorphism).

For $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\} \in \mathcal{N}$ with $k > 1$ let $\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ be given. We choose a small connected open neighborhood O of $u_I = \pi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$ in W_I and consider the inverse image $O(\tilde{u}_{i_l}) = \pi^{-1}_{i_l}(O)$ of O in $\widetilde{W}_{i_l}$, $l = 1, \cdots, k$. Then each $O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ is an open neighborhood of $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$ in $\widetilde{W}_{i_l}$, and the *stabilizer subgroup* $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ of Γ_{i_l} at $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$ acts on $O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$. If O is small enough, for any fixed $s \in \{1, \cdots, k\}$ it follows from the definition of the orbifold that there exist PS diffeomorphisms $\lambda_{i_s i_l} : O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ mapping $\tilde{u}_{i_s}$ to $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$, and group isomorphisms $\mathcal{A}_{i_s i_l} : \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) \to \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ such that

$$\lambda_{i_s i_l} \circ \phi = \mathcal{A}_{i_s i_l}(\phi) \circ \lambda_{i_s i_l} \tag{3.24}$$

for $\phi \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and $l \in \{1, \cdots, k\} \setminus \{s\}$. These PS diffeomorphisms $\lambda_{i_s i_l}$ $(s \neq l)$ in (3.24) are unique up to composition with elements in $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$. Namely, if we have another PS diffeomorphism $\lambda'_{i_s i_l} : O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ that maps $\tilde{u}_{i_s}$ to $\tilde{u}_{i_l}$, and the group isomorphism $\mathcal{A}'_{i_s i_l} : \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ such that

$$\lambda'_{i_s i_l} \circ \phi = \mathcal{A}'_{i_s i_l}(\phi) \circ \lambda'_{i_s i_l}$$

for any $\phi \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$, then there exist $\phi_{i_s} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and $\phi_{i_l} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$ such that

$$\lambda_{i_s i_l} = \phi_{i_l} \circ \lambda'_{i_s i_l} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{i_s i_l} = \lambda'_{i_s i_l} \circ \phi_{i_s}.$$

In particular these imply that

$$\lambda_{i_l i_s} \circ \lambda_{i_s i_l} = \phi_{i_s} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{i_t i_s} \circ \lambda_{i_l i_t} \circ \lambda_{i_s i_l} = \phi'_{i_s}.$$

for some $\phi_{i_s}, \phi'_{i_s} \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ if $s \neq l, t$ and $l \neq t$. For convenience we make the convention that $\lambda_{i_s i_s} = id_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{i_s i_s} = 1_{\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}$. Then we have $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ PS embeddings from $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ into $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ given by

$$\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s : \tilde{u}_s \mapsto \big(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{u}_s)\big)_{i \in I}, \tag{3.25}$$

where $\lambda_I^s = (\lambda_{i_s i})_{i \in I}$ with $\lambda_{i_s i_s} = id_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}$, and $\phi_I = (\phi_i)_{i \in I}$ belongs to

$$\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s := \Big\{(\phi_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_{l=1}^{k} \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_l}) \;\Big|\; \phi_{i_s} = 1\Big\}. \tag{3.26}$$

Hereafter saying $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s$ to be a PS embedding from $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ into $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ means that $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s$ is a PS embedding from $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ into the PS Banach manifold $\prod_{l=1}^k \widetilde{W}_{i_l}$ and that the image $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ is in $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ if $I = \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}$. Furthermore, $(\tilde{u}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{u}_{i_k}) \in \prod_{l=1}^k O(\tilde{u}_{i_l}) \subset \prod_{l=1}^k \widetilde{W}_{i_l}$ is contained in $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ if and only if

$$(\tilde{u}_{i_1}, \cdots, \tilde{u}_{i_k}) = \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$$

for some $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$. So the neighborhood

$$\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I) := \pi_I^{-1}(O) = \Big(\prod_{l=1}^{k} O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})\Big) \cap \widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$$

of $\tilde{u}_I$ in $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ can be identified with an union of $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ copies of $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$,

$$\bigcup_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s} \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s\big(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\big). \tag{3.27}$$

Clearly, for any two different elements ϕ_I, ϕ'_I in $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s\big(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\big) \cap \phi'_I \circ \lambda_I^s\big(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\big) = \\ &\big\{(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{v}))_{i \in I} \;\big|\; \tilde{v} \in O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \;\&\; (\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{v}))_{i \in I} = (\phi'_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{v}))_{i \in I}\big\} \supseteq \{\tilde{u}_I\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

In order to show that $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ is a stratified Banach variety, we need to prove that these $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ sets, $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$, $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$ are intrinsic in the following sense that

$$\big\{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s\big(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\big) \;\big|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\} = \big\{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^t\big(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t})\big) \;\big|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_t\big\} \tag{3.29}$$

for any two s, t in $\{1, \cdots, k\}$. This is easily proved, cf., [LuT].

Similarly, (by shrinking O if necessary) using the properties of orbifold bundles one has also the PS bundle isomorphisms

$$\Lambda_{i_s i_l} : \widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})} \tag{3.30}$$

that are lifting of $\lambda_{i_s i_l}$, i.e. $\lambda_{i_s i_l} \cdot \tilde{p}_{i_s} = \tilde{p}_{i_l} \cdot \Lambda_{i_s i_l}$, to satisfy

$$\Lambda_{i_s i_l} \circ \Phi = \boxed{\mathcal{A}_{i_s i_l}(\phi)} \circ \Lambda_{i_s i_l} \tag{3.31}$$

for any $\phi \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ and $l \in \{1, \cdots, k\} \setminus \{s\}$. Hereafter

$$\Phi : \widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})} \;\big(\text{resp. } \boxed{\mathcal{A}_{i_s i_l}(\phi)} : \widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})} \to \widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})}\big) \tag{3.32}$$

is the PS bundle isomorphism lifting of ϕ (resp. $\mathcal{A}_{i_s i_l}(\phi)$) produced in the definition of orbifold bundles. (*Here we understand* $\phi_{i_l}\in\Gamma_{i_l}$ *to acts on* $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}$ *via* $\phi_{i_l}\cdot\tilde{\xi}=\Phi_{i_l}(\tilde{\xi})$ *with* $\Phi_{i_l}=\lambda_{W_{i_l}}(\phi_{i_l})$ *the lifting bundle automorphism of* ϕ_{i_l} *and* $\tilde{\xi}\in\widetilde{E}_{i_l}$*.*) It is easy to see that Φ_{i_l} maps $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})}$ to $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})}$. In particular the restriction of it to $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})}$ is also a PS bundle automorphism of $\widetilde{E}_{i_l}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})}$ that is a lift of ϕ_{i_l}, still denoted by Φ_{i_l}. So for the above $\lambda^s_I=(\lambda_{i_s i})_{i\in I}$ with $\lambda_{i_s i_s}=id_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}$, and $\phi_I=(\phi_i)_{i\in I}\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$ we get the corresponding

$$\Phi_I:=(\Phi_i)_{i\in I}\quad\text{and}\quad\Lambda^s_I:=(\Lambda_{i_s i})_{i\in I},\tag{3.33}$$

where we have made the convention that

$$\Phi_{i_s}=1\quad\text{and}\quad\Lambda_{i_s i_s}=id_{\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}}.\tag{3.34}$$

Corresponding with (3.25) we obtain $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ PS bundle embeddings

$$\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I:\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}\to\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I},\ \tilde{\xi}\mapsto\big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\tag{3.35}$$

for $\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$. Clearly, each map

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})})\to\phi_I\circ\lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})),\\&\big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\mapsto\big(\phi_i\circ\lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{p}_{i_s}(\tilde{\xi}))\big)_{i\in I}\end{aligned}$$

gives a stratified Banach vector bundle over the stratified Banach manifold $\phi_I\circ\lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$, and

$$\bigcup_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})})=\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}\Big|_{\bigcup_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\phi_I\circ\lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))}.$$

Corresponding with (3.28) and (3.29) we have also:

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})})\bigcap\Phi'_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})})=\\&\big\{\big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\ \big|\ \tilde{\xi}\in\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}\ \&\ \big(\Phi_i\circ\Lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}=\big(\Phi'_i\circ\Lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{\xi})\big)_{i\in I}\big\}.\end{aligned}\tag{3.36}$$

for any two different ϕ_I,ψ_I in $\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$, and

$$\big\{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})})\ \big|\ \phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\}=\big\{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^t_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_t}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_t})})\ \big|\ \phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_t\big\}\tag{3.37}$$

for any $s,t\in\{1,\cdots,k\}$. *Therefore* $\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}\to\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *is a union of* $|\Gamma(\tilde{u}_{i_s})|^{k-1}$ *stratified Banach vector bundles near* $\tilde{u}_I$*.*

Remark 3.6. By shrinking O we may also assume that each $\lambda_{i_s i_l}$ in (3.24) is not only a PS diffeomorphism from $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ to $O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$, but also one from a neighborhood of the closure of $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ to that of $O(\tilde{u}_{i_l})$. In this case the union in (3.27) may be required to satisfy:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{If }\tilde{v}\in\bigcup_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s}\phi_I\circ\lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))\text{ and }\tilde{v}\notin\phi_I\circ\lambda^t_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))\text{ for some }t,\\ \text{then }\tilde{v}\notin Cl\big(\phi_I\circ\lambda^t_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))\big).\end{array}\right.\tag{3.38}$$

In fact, if $\tilde{v}\in Cl\big(\phi_I\circ\lambda^t_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))\big)\backslash\phi_I\circ\lambda^t_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))$ then there exists a unique $\tilde{x}\in Cl(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))$, which must sit in $Cl(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))\setminus O(\tilde{u}_{i_t})$, such that $\phi_I\circ\lambda^t_I(\tilde{x})=\tilde{v}$. Moreover, since $\tilde{v}$ belongs to some $\phi'_I \circ \lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ one has a unique $\tilde{y} \in Cl(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$, which must sit in $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$, such that $\phi'_i \circ \lambda^s_I(\tilde{y}) = \tilde{v}$. So $\phi_I \circ \lambda^t_I(\tilde{x}) = \phi'_I \circ \lambda^s_I(\tilde{y})$. For the sake of clearness we assume $t = 1$ and $s = 2$ then

$$\big(\tilde{x}, \phi_{i_2} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_2}(\tilde{x}), \cdots, \phi_{i_k} \circ \lambda_{i_1 i_k}(\tilde{x})\big) = \big(\phi'_{i_1} \circ \lambda_{i_2 i_1}(\tilde{y}), \tilde{y}, \phi'_{i_3} \circ \lambda_{i_3 i_1}(\tilde{y}), \cdots, \phi'_{i_k} \circ \lambda_{i_2 i_k}(\tilde{x})\big).$$

Therefore $\tilde{x} = \phi'_{i_1} \circ \lambda_{i_2 i_1}(\tilde{y})$. Note that both PS diffeomorphisms ϕ'_{i_1} and $\lambda_{i_2 i_1}$ map $O(\tilde{u}_{i_2})$ to $O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})$. We deduce that $\tilde{x} = \phi'_{i_1} \circ \lambda_{i_2 i_1}(\tilde{y}) \in O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})$. This contradicts that $\tilde{x} \in Cl(O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})) \backslash O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})$. Equation (3.38) is proved. Similarly, we also require that

$$\begin{cases} \text{If } \tilde{\xi} \in \bigcup_{\Phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s} \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})) \text{ and } \tilde{\xi} \notin \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^t_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t})) \text{ for some } t, \\ \text{then } \tilde{\xi} \notin Cl\big(\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^t_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))\big). \end{cases} \tag{3.39}$$

Later we always assume that (3.38) and (3.39) hold without special statements.

In terms of [LiuT3] we introduce:

Definition 3.7. *The family of the PS embeddings given by (3.25),* $\{\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$, *is called a* **local coordinate chart of** $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *over a neighborhood* $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I)$ *of* $\tilde{u}_I$*, each* $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I$ *a* **component** *of this chart. Similarly, we call the family of the PS bundle embeddings given by (3.35),* $\{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^s_I \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$, *a* **local bundle coordinate chart of** $\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ **over** $\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I)$*, each* $\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^s_I$ *a* **component** *of it. For* $\tilde{x}_I \in \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$*, a connected relative open subset* $W \subset \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ *containing* $\tilde{u}_I$ *is called a* **local component of** $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ **near** $\tilde{x}_I$*. In particular,* $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ *is a local component of* $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *near* $\tilde{u}_I$*. The restriction of* $\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})})$ *to a local component near* $\tilde{u}_I$ *is called a* **local component of** $\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ **near** $\tilde{u}_I$*. Two local components of* $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *(or* $\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}$*) near a point* $\tilde{u}_I$ *of* $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *are said to belong to different kinds if the intersection of both is not a local component of* $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *near* $\tilde{u}_I$*. Let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be a family of local components near a point* $\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$*. If the union of sets in* $\mathcal{A}$ *forms an open neighborhood* $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{u})$ *of* $\tilde{u}_I$ *in* $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *we call* $\mathcal{A}$ **a complete family of local components of** $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ **over** $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{u}_I)$*.*

Equations (3.29) and (3.37) show that we construct the same complete families of local components starting from two different s and t. Moreover, suppose that $Q \subset O$ is another small open neighborhood of u_I in W_I. Then all above constructions work if we replace O with Q, and the corresponding local components of $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ near $\tilde{u}_I$ and those of $\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ near $(\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I})_{\tilde{u}_I}$ are, respectively, given by

$$\big\{\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(Q(\tilde{u}_{i_s})) \;\big|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\} \quad \text{and} \quad \big\{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{Q(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}) \;\big|\; \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\big\}. \tag{3.40}$$

Here $Q(\tilde{u}_{i_l}) = \pi_{i_l}^{-1}(Q)$ are the inverse images of Q in $\widetilde{W}_{i_l}$, $l = 1, \cdots, k$, and $\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I$ and $\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^s_I$ as in (3.25) and (3.35). As stated in Lemma 4.3 of [LiuT3] we have:

Proposition 3.8. *The notion of local component is functorial with respect to restrictions and projections, that is:*

(i) *If* $\{\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ *is a local coordinate chart near* $\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$*, then for each point* $\tilde{y}_I \in \cup_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s} \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ *there exists a neighborhood* $\mathcal{Q}$ *of* $\tilde{y}_I$ *in* $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *such that* $\{\mathcal{Q} \cap \phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})) \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ *is a complete family of local components of* $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *over* $\mathcal{Q}$*.*

(ii) *If* $\{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s\,|\,\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s\}$ *is a local coordinate chart near* $\tilde u_I\in\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$, $i_s\in J\hookrightarrow I$, *then* $\{\tilde\pi_J^I\circ\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s\,|\,\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s\}$ *is a local coordinate chart near* $\tilde\pi_J^I(\tilde u_I)\in\widetilde{W}_J^{\Gamma_J}$ *(after the repeating maps* $\tilde\pi_J^I\circ\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s$ *is only taken a time). In particular, not only the projection* $\tilde\pi_J^I:\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}\to\widetilde{W}_J^{\Gamma_J}$ *maps the local component* $\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))$ *near* $\tilde u_I$ *to the local component* $\tilde\pi_J^I(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s})))$ *near* $\tilde\pi_J^I(\tilde u_I)$ *in* $\widetilde{W}_J^{\Gamma_J}$ *but also the restriction*

$$\tilde\pi_J^I|_{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))}:\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))\to\tilde\pi_J^I(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s})))$$

is a PS map. Actually one has $\tilde\pi_J^I\circ\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s=\lambda_J^I(\phi_I)\circ\lambda_J^s=\phi_J\circ\lambda_J^s$, *where* $\lambda_J^s=(\lambda_{i_s l})_{l\in J}$.

(iii) *Correspondingly, the restriction of the projection* $\widetilde\Pi_J^I:\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}\to\widetilde{E}_J^{\Gamma_J}$ *to* $\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}|_{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))}$ *is a PS bundle map from* $\widetilde{E}_I^{\Gamma_I}|_{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))}$ *to* $\widetilde{E}_J^{\Gamma_J}|_{\pi_J^I(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s})))}$.

Proof. (i) By (3.38) we may choose a connected open neighborhood $\mathcal{Q}\subset\pi_I^{-1}(O)$ of $\tilde y_I$ in $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ such that for any $\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s$,

$$\mathcal{Q}\cap Cl(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s})))=\emptyset\quad\text{as}\quad\tilde y_I\notin\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s})).$$

If $y_I\in\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))$ then the connected relative open subset $\mathcal{Q}\cap\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))$ in $\phi_i\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))$ is a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ near $\tilde v_I$. It is easy to see that the union of sets in $\{\mathcal{Q}\cap\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))\,|\,\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s\}$ is equal to $\mathcal{Q}$. So (i) holds.

(ii) We may assume that $I=\{i_1,\cdots,i_k\}$ and $J=\{i_1,\cdots,i_{k'}\}$ with $k'<k$. By (3.39) we may also take $s=1$. Then by (3.26) we have

$$\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_1=\big\{(1,\phi_{i_2},\cdots,\phi_{i_k})\;\big|\;\phi_{i_l}\in\Gamma(\tilde u_{i_l}),l=2,\cdots,k\big\},$$
$$\Gamma(\tilde\pi_J^I(\tilde u_I))_1=\big\{(1,\phi_{i_2},\cdots,\phi_{i_{k'}})\;\big|\;\phi_{i_l}\in\Gamma(\tilde u_{i_l}),l=2,\cdots,k'\big\}.$$

That is, $\lambda_J^I(\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_1)=\Gamma(\tilde\pi_J^I(\tilde u_I))_1$. So for a given local component

$$\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^1(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))=\big\{\big(\tilde x,\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde x),\cdots,\phi_{i_k}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_k}(\tilde x)\big)\;\big|\;\tilde x\in O(\tilde u_{i_1})\big\}$$

of $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ near $\tilde u_I$, we have a corresponding local component of $\widetilde{W}_J^{\Gamma_J}$ near $\tilde\pi_J^I(\tilde u_I)$ as follow:

$$\phi_J\circ\lambda_J^1(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))=\big\{\big(\tilde x_1,\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde x),\cdots,\phi_{i'_k}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_{k'}}(\tilde x)\big)\;\big|\;\tilde x\in O(\tilde u_{i_1})\big\}.$$

Here $\phi_J=(1,\phi_{i_2},\cdots,\phi_{i_{k'}})=\lambda_J^I(\phi_I)\in\Gamma(\tilde\pi_J^I(\tilde u_I))_1$ and $\lambda_J^1=(\phi_{i_1l})_{l\in J}$. Clearly, $\tilde\pi_J^I\circ\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^1=\lambda_J^I(\phi_I)\circ\lambda_J^1=\phi_J\circ\lambda_J^1$, and so $\tilde\pi_J^I\big(\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^1(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))\big)=\phi_J\circ\lambda_J^1(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))$. Moreover the restriction

$$\tilde\pi_J^I|_{\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^1(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))}:\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^1(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))\to\phi_J\circ\lambda_J^1(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))$$

given by

$$\big(\tilde x,\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde x),\cdots,\phi_{i_k}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_k}(\tilde x)\big)\mapsto\big(\tilde x,\phi_{i_2}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_2}(\tilde x),\cdots,\phi_{i_{k'}}\circ\lambda_{i_1i_{k'}}(\tilde x)\big)$$

is a PS map. (ii) is proved. □

The arguments below Definition 3.7 and Proposition 3.8 show that the notion of the local component is intrinsic. Now for each $I=\{i_1,\cdots,i_k\}\in\mathcal{N}$ with $|I|>1$, we can desingularize $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ to get a true stratified Banach manifold $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$. Consider the stratified Banach manifold

$$\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}}:=\coprod_{\tilde u_I\in\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}}\;\coprod_{O\in\mathcal{U}(u_I)}\;\coprod_{1\le s\le|I|}\;\coprod_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s}\phi_I\circ\lambda_I^s(O(\tilde u_{i_s}))\tag{3.41}$$

where $\mathcal{U}(u_I)$ is the germ of small connected open neighborhood of $u_I = \pi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$ in W_I and $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) = \pi_{i_s}^{-1}(O)$, $s = 1, \cdots, |I|$. We define the equivalence relation $\sim$ in $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}}$ as follows. For $\tilde{u}_I, \tilde{u}'_I \in \widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$, and $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$, $\phi'_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}'_I)_t$, and $\tilde{y}_I \in \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ and $\tilde{y}'_I \in \phi'_I \circ \lambda_I^{t\prime}(O'(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))$ we define

$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}'_I, \phi'_I, \tilde{y}'_I) \tag{3.42}$$

if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) $\tilde{y}_I = \tilde{y}'_I$ as points in $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$;

(ii) $\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})) \bigcap \phi'_I \circ \lambda_I^{\prime t}(O'(\tilde{u}_{i_t}))$ is a local component of $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ near $\tilde{y}_I = \tilde{y}'_I$.

Clearly, any two different points in $\{(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I)\} \times \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ are not equivalent with respect to $\sim$. Denote by $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]$ the equivalence class of $(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I)$, and by

$$\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I} = \boxed{\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}} \Big/ \sim$$

if $|I| > 1$, and by $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I} = \widetilde{W}_i$ if $I = \{i\} \in \mathcal{N}$. Then $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ is a stratified Banach manifold. Note that (3.26) implies that each point in $\{(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I)\} \times \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}))$ with $s > 1$ must be equivalent to some point in $\{(\tilde{u}_I, \phi'_I)\} \times \phi'_I \circ \lambda_I^1(O(\tilde{u}_{i_1}))$ for some $\phi'_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1$ with respect to $\sim$. So

$$\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I} = \coprod_{\tilde{u}_I \in \widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}} \coprod_{O \in \mathcal{U}(u_I)} \coprod_{\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_1} \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})) \Big/ \sim \tag{3.43}$$

if $|I| > 1$. Now for each $s = 1, \cdots, k$,

$$\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s} : O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to \widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\tilde{x})], \tag{3.44}$$

gives a PS open embedding, called *a local coordinate chart of* $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ *near* $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{u}_I]$. The projections $\tilde{\pi}_I$ and $\tilde{\pi}_J^I$ induce natural ones

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_I &: \widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I} \to W_I, \quad [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \mapsto \tilde{\pi}_I(\tilde{y}_I), \\ \hat{\pi}_J^I &: \widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I} \to \widehat{W}_J^{\Gamma_J},\ [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \mapsto [\tilde{u}_J, \phi_J, \tilde{y}_J], \end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

where $\phi_J = \lambda_J^I(\phi_I) = (\phi_l)_{l \in J}$, $\tilde{u}_J = \tilde{\pi}_J^I(\tilde{u}_I) = (\tilde{u}_l)_{l \in J}$ and $\tilde{y}_J = \tilde{\pi}_J^I(\tilde{y}_I) = (\tilde{y}_l)_{l \in J}$. By Proposition 3.8(ii) the map $\hat{\pi}_J^I$ is well-defined, and in the charts $\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1}$ and

$$\widehat{\phi_J \circ \lambda_J^1} : O(\tilde{u}_{j_1}) \to \widehat{W}_J^{\Gamma_J},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto [\tilde{u}_J, \phi_J, \phi_J \circ \lambda_J^1(\tilde{x})],$$

the projection $\hat{\pi}_J^I$ may be represented by

$$O(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) \to O(\tilde{u}_{j_1}),\ \tilde{x} \mapsto \lambda_{i_1 j_1}(\tilde{x})$$

because $j_1 \in J \subset I$. Here $\lambda_{i_1 j_1} = 1_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})}$ if $j_1 = i_1$. This shows that $\hat{\pi}_J^I$ *is a PS map.* As $\tilde{\pi}_J^I$ in (3.23), $\hat{\pi}_J^I$ is not surjective in general if $I \neq J$.

Note that the action of Γ_I on $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ in (3.22) induces a natural one on $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}}$. For any $\psi_I = (\psi_l)_{l\in I} \in \Gamma_I$ and $\tilde{y}_I = \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(\tilde{x}) \in \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^1(O(\tilde{u}_{i_1}))$ we have

$$\psi_I \cdot \tilde{y}_I = \psi_I(\tilde{y}_I) = \phi_I^* \circ \lambda_I^{1*}(\psi_{i_1}(\tilde{x})) \in \phi_I^* \circ \lambda_I^{1*}(\psi_{i_1}(O(\tilde{u}_{i_1}))),$$

where $\phi_I^* = (\phi_l^*)_{l\in I} \in \Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_1$, $\phi_l^* = \psi_l \circ \phi_l \circ \psi_l^{-1}$ for $l \in I$, and $\lambda_I^{1*} = (\lambda_{i_1 l}^*)_{l\in I}$, $\lambda_{i_1 l}^* = \psi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l} \circ \psi_{i_1}^{-1}$ for any $l \in I$. So one may define

$$\psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) = \big(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi_I^*, \psi_I(\tilde{y}_I)\big). \tag{3.46}$$

Clearly, this gives a PS action of Γ_I on the space $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}}$. Note that the above ϕ_I^* belongs to $\Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_s$ as $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$. Moreover, for $s \in \{1, \cdots, k\}$ and $l \in I$, if we define $\lambda_I^{s*} = (\lambda_{i_s l}^*)_{l\in I}$, $\lambda_{i_s l}^* = \psi_l \circ \lambda_{i_s l} \circ \psi_{i_s}^{-1}$, then

$$\phi_I^* \circ \lambda_I^{s*} : \psi_{i_s}(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})) \to \widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I},\ \tilde{z}_s \mapsto \big(\phi_l^* \circ \lambda_{i_s l}^*(\tilde{z}_s)\big)_{l\in I}$$

is a PS open embedding, and $\{\phi_I^* \circ \lambda_I^{s*} \mid \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a local coordinate chart of $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ over the neighborhood $\psi_I\big(O(\tilde{u}_I)\big)$ of $\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$ in the sense of Definition 3.7. In particular, we get a local coordinate chart of $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ near $[\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi_I^*, \psi_I(\tilde{u}_I)]$,

$$\widehat{\phi_I^* \circ \lambda_I^{*1}} : \psi_{i_s}(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})) \to \widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto [\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi_I^*, \phi_I^* \circ \lambda_I^{*s}(\tilde{x})]. \tag{3.47}$$

From these and (3.43) it follows that the action in (3.46) preserves the equivalence relation $\sim$ in $\boxed{\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}}$, i.e.

$$(\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim (\tilde{u}_I', \phi_I', \tilde{y}_I') \Longleftrightarrow \psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I) \sim \psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I', \phi_I', \tilde{y}_I').$$

Consequently, (3.46) induces a natural action of Γ_I on $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$:

$$\psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] = [\psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I)]\ \forall \psi_I \in \Gamma_I. \tag{3.48}$$

The action is also partially smooth because in the charts in (3.44) and (3.47)

$$[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] = [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda_I^s(\tilde{x})] \mapsto \psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]$$

is given by

$$O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to \psi_{i_s}(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})), \quad \tilde{x} \mapsto \psi_{i_s}(\tilde{x}).$$

There is also a continuous surjective map

$$q_I : \widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I} \to \widetilde{W}_I,\ [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \mapsto \tilde{y}_I \tag{3.49}$$

such that $\tilde{\pi}_I \circ q_I = \hat{\pi}_I$. By (3.46) and (3.48), q_I commutates with the actions on $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ and $\widetilde{W}_I$, i.e. $q_I(\psi_I \cdot [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]) = \psi_I \cdot (q_I([\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I]))$ for each $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{y}_I] \in \widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ and $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$. These imply that q_I induces a continuous surjective map $\hat{q}_I$ from $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}/\Gamma_I$ to $\widetilde{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}/\Gamma_I$. Hence $\hat{\pi}_I$ induces a continuous surjective map from $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}/\Gamma_I$ to W_I. Summarizing the above arguments we get:

Proposition 3.9 (i) *Each $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ is a stratified Banach manifold and $\hat{\pi}_J^I$ is a PS map.*
(ii) *There exists a natural PS action of Γ_I on $\widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$ under which $\hat{\pi}_I$ is invariant and thus induces*

a continuous surjective map from $\widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I/\Gamma_I$ *to* W_I.
(iii) $\hat\pi_J\circ\hat\pi^I_J=\iota^W_{IJ}\circ\hat\pi_I$ *for any* $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$ *and the inclusion* $\iota^W_{IJ}:W_I\hookrightarrow W_J$.
(iv) $\hat\pi^I_J\circ\psi_I=\lambda^I_J(\psi_I)\circ\hat\pi^I_J$ *for any* $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$ *and* $\psi_I\in\Gamma_I$.

Similarly we can define a desingularization $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ of $\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ and the bundle projection $\hat p_I:\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I\to\widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ so that the restriction of it to each stratum of $\widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ is a Banach vector bundle. We shall give necessary details. Consider the stratified Banach manifold

$$\boxed{\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I}:=\coprod_{\tilde u_I\in\widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I}\coprod_{O\in\mathcal{U}(u_I)}\coprod_{1\le s\le|I|}\coprod_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s}\{(\tilde u_I,\phi_I)\}\times\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde u_{i_s})}).\tag{3.50}$$

Clearly, it is a stratified Banach bundle over $\boxed{\widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I}$. Here $\mathcal{U}(u_I)$ and $O(\tilde u_{i_s})=\pi^{-1}_{i_s}(O)$ are as in (3.41), and Φ_I and Λ^s_I as in (3.33). Define the equivalence relation $\overset{e}{\sim}$ in $\boxed{\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I}$ as follows: For $\tilde u_I,\tilde u'_I\in\widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$, and $\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_s$, $\phi'_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u'_I)_t$, and $\tilde\xi_I\in\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde u_{i_s})})$ and $\tilde\xi'_I\in\Phi'_I\circ\Lambda'^t_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_t}|_{O(\tilde u'_{i_t})})$ we define

$$(\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\tilde\xi_I)\overset{e}{\sim}(\tilde u'_I,\phi'_I,\tilde\xi'_I)\tag{3.51}$$

if and only if the following two conditions hold:

(A) $\tilde\xi_I=\tilde\xi'_I$ as points in $\widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$;

(B) $\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde u_{i_s})})\bigcap\Phi'_I\circ\Lambda'^t_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_t}|_{O(\tilde u'_{i_t})})$ is a local component of $\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ near the fibre at $\tilde p_I(\tilde\xi_I)=\tilde p_I(\tilde\xi'_I)$, where $\tilde p_I:\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I\to\widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ is the obvious projection.

It is easy to see that the relation $\overset{e}{\sim}$ is compatible with $\sim$ in (3.42). Denote by $\langle\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\tilde\xi_I\rangle$ the equivalence class of $(\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\tilde\xi_I)$, and by

$$\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I:=\boxed{\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I}\Big/\overset{e}{\sim}$$

if $|I|>1$, and by $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I=\widetilde{E}_i$ if $I=\{i\}\in\mathcal{N}$. As in (3.43) it holds that

$$\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I=\coprod_{\tilde u_I\in\widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I}\coprod_{O\in\mathcal{U}(u_I)}\coprod_{\phi_I\in\Gamma(\tilde u_I)_1}\{(\tilde u_I,\phi_I)\}\times\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde u_{i_1})})\Big/\overset{e}{\sim}.$$

Clearly, we get a stratified Banach bundle,

$$\hat p_I:\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I\to\widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I,\ \langle\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\tilde\xi_I\rangle\mapsto[\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\tilde p_I(\tilde\xi_I)].\tag{3.52}$$

For each $s=1,\cdots,k$, we have also the PS bundle open embedding,

$$\widehat{\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I}:\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{\widetilde{O}_{i_s}}\to\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I,\ \tilde\xi\mapsto\langle\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\Phi_I\circ\Lambda^s_I(\tilde\xi)\rangle,\tag{3.53}$$

called *a local bundle coordinate chart of* $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ *near* $\langle\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\tilde o_I(\tilde u_I)\rangle$. Here $\tilde o_I:\widetilde{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I\to\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ is the zero section. By Proposition 3.8(iii) the projections $\widetilde{\Pi}_I$ and $\widetilde{\Pi}^I_J$ induce natural ones

$$\widehat{\Pi}_I:\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I\to E_I,\ \langle\tilde u_I,\phi_I,\tilde\xi_I\rangle\mapsto\widetilde{\Pi}_I(\tilde\xi_I),$$

$$\widehat{\Pi}^I_J : \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_J}_J,\ \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle \mapsto \langle \tilde{u}_J, \phi_J, \tilde{\xi}_J\rangle, \tag{3.54}$$

where $\phi_J = \lambda^I_J(\phi_I) = (\phi_l)_{l\in J}$, $\tilde{u}_J = \tilde{\pi}^I_J(\tilde{u}_I) = (\tilde{u}_l)_{l\in J}$ and $\tilde{\xi}_J = \widetilde{\Pi}^I_J(\tilde{\xi}_I) = (\tilde{\xi}_l)_{l\in J}$. In the bundle charts $\widehat{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I}$ and

$$\widehat{\Phi_J \circ \Lambda^1_J} : \widetilde{E}_{j_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{j_1})} \to \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_J}_J,\ \tilde{\eta} \mapsto \langle \tilde{u}_J, \phi_J, \Phi_J \circ \Lambda^1_J(\tilde{\eta})\rangle, \tag{3.55}$$

the projection $\widehat{\Pi}^I_J$ may be represented by

$$\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})} \to \widetilde{E}_{j_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{j_1})},\ \tilde{\xi} \mapsto \Lambda_{i_1 j_1}(\tilde{\xi}) \tag{3.56}$$

because $j_1 \in J \subset I$. Here $\Lambda_{i_1 j_1} = 1_{\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})}}$ if $j_1 = i_1$. Hence $\widehat{\Pi}^I_J$ is a *PS bundle map* and also *isomorphically maps* the fibre of $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ at $\hat{x}_I \in \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ to that of $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_J}_J$ at $\hat{\pi}^I_J(\hat{x}_I) \in \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_J}_J$. By (3.51) we may define a natural norm in each fibre of $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ by

$$\|\langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle\| := \sum_{l\in I} \|\tilde{\xi}_l\| \tag{3.57}$$

for any vector $\langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle$ in the fibre of $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ at $[\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{x}_I)] \in \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$, where $\|\tilde{\xi}_l\|$ denotes the norm of $\tilde{\xi}_l$ in $(\widetilde{E}_l)_{\tilde{x}_l}$. The action of Γ_I on $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ induces a natural one on $\boxed{\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I}$,

$$\psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I) = \big(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi^*_I, \psi_I \cdot \tilde{\xi}_I\big) \tag{3.58}$$

for any $\psi_I = (\psi_l)_{l\in I} \in \Gamma_I$. Here $\phi^*_I = (\phi^*_l)_{l\in I} = (\psi_l \circ \phi_l \circ \psi_l^{-1})_{l\in I} \in \Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_1$ as in (3.45), and

$$\psi_I \cdot \tilde{\xi}_I = \Psi_I(\tilde{\xi}_I) = (\Psi_l(\tilde{\xi}_l))_{l\in I} = \Phi^*_I \circ \Lambda^{1*}_I(\Psi_{i_1}(\tilde{\eta})) \in \Phi^*_I \circ \Lambda^{1*}_I\big(\Psi_{i_1}(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})})\big)$$

for $\tilde{\xi}_I = \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I(\tilde{\eta}) \in \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I(\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})})$ and $\Phi^*_I = (\Phi^*_l)_{l\in I} = (\Psi_l \circ \Phi_l \circ \Psi_l^{-1})_{l\in I}$, and $\Lambda^{1*}_I = (\Lambda^*_{i_1 l})_{l\in I}$, $\Lambda^*_{i_1 l} = \Psi_l \circ \Lambda_{i_1 l} \circ \Psi_{i_1}^{-1}$ for any $l \in I$. Equation (3.58) gives a PS action of Γ_I on $\boxed{\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I}$. For each $s \in \{1, \cdots, k\}$, as above if $\phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s$ then ϕ^*_I belongs to $\Gamma(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))_s$. Let us define $\Lambda^{s*}_I = (\Lambda^*_{i_s l})_{l\in I}$, $\Lambda^*_{i_s l} = \Psi_l \circ \Lambda_{i_s l} \circ \Psi_{i_s}^{-1}$ for any $l \in I$, then

$$\Phi^*_I \circ \Lambda^{s*}_I : \Psi_{i_s}(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}) \to \widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I,\ \tilde{\xi}_s \mapsto \big(\Phi^*_l \circ \Lambda^*_{i_s l}(\tilde{\xi}_s)\big)_{l\in I}$$

is a PS bundle open embedding, and $\{\Phi^*_I \circ \Lambda^{s*}_I \,|\, \phi_I \in \Gamma(\tilde{u}_I)_s\}$ is a local bundle coordinate chart of $\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ over the neighborhood $\psi_I\big(\widetilde{O}(\tilde{u}_I)\big)$ of $\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I)$. In particular, we get a local bundle coordinate chart of $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ near $\langle \psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi^*_I, \tilde{o}_I(\psi_I(\tilde{u}_I))\rangle$,

$$\widehat{\Phi^*_I \circ \Lambda^{*1}_I} : \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{\psi_{i_1}(O(\tilde{u}_{i_1}))} \to \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I,\ \tilde{\xi} \mapsto \langle \psi_I(\tilde{u}_I), \phi^*_I, \Phi^*_I \circ \Lambda^{*1}_I(\tilde{\xi})\rangle. \tag{3.59}$$

Moreover one easily checks that the action in (3.58) preserves the equivalence relation $\overset{e}{\sim}$ in $\boxed{\widetilde{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I}$ and thus induces a natural action of Γ_I on $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I$:

$$\psi_I \cdot \langle \tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I\rangle = \langle \psi_I \cdot (\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \tilde{\xi}_I)\rangle \tag{3.60}$$

for any $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$. Note that in the charts $\widehat{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I}$ in (3.53) and $\widehat{\Phi^*_I \circ \Lambda^{*1}_I}$ in (3.59)

$$\langle \tilde u_I, \phi_I, \tilde\xi_I\rangle = \langle \tilde u_I, \phi_I, \Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I(\tilde\eta)\rangle \mapsto \psi_I \cdot \langle \tilde u_I, \phi_I, \tilde\xi_I\rangle$$

is given by

$$\widetilde E_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde u_{i_1})} \to \widetilde E_{i_1}|_{\psi_{i_1}(O(\tilde u_{i_1}))}, \quad \tilde\eta \mapsto \Psi_{i_1}(\tilde\eta).$$

So (3.60) defines a *PS action of* Γ_I on $\widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I$. Moreover, the clear continuous surjective map

$$Q_I : \widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widetilde E_I,\ \langle \tilde u_I, \phi_I, \tilde\xi_I\rangle \mapsto \tilde\xi_I$$

commutates with the above actions of Γ_I on $\widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I$ and $\widetilde E_I$ and also satisfies $\widetilde\Pi_I \circ Q_I = \widehat\Pi_I$. It follows that the projection $\widehat\Pi_I$ is invariant under the Γ_I-action and induces a continuous surjective map

$$\widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I/\Gamma_I \to E_I,\ \langle \tilde u_I, \phi_I, \tilde\xi_I\rangle \mapsto \widetilde\Pi_I(\tilde\xi_I).$$

Summarizing up the above arguments we get:

Proposition 3.10. (i) *Each* $\hat p_I : \widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widehat W^{\Gamma_I}_I$ *is a stratified Banach bundle and* $\widehat\Pi^I_J$ *is a PS bundle map.*

(ii) *There exists a PS action of* Γ_I *on* $\widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I$ *(given by (3.60)) under which* $\widehat\Pi_I$ *is invariant and induces a continuous surjective map from* $\widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I/\Gamma_I$ *to* E_I.

(iii) *The projection* $\hat p_I : \widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widehat W^{\Gamma_I}_I$ *is equivariant with respect to the actions of* Γ_I *on them, i.e.* $\hat p_I \circ \psi_I = \psi_I \circ \hat p_I$ *for any* $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$.

(iv) $\hat\Pi_J \circ \hat\Pi^I_J = \iota^E_{IJ} \circ \hat\Pi_I$ *for any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal N$ *and the inclusion* $\iota^E_{IJ} : E_I \hookrightarrow E_J$.

(v) $\widehat\Pi^I_J \circ \psi_I = \lambda^I_J(\psi_I) \circ \widehat\Pi^I_J$ *for any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal N$ *and* $\psi_I \in \Gamma_I$.

(vi) $\hat\pi_I \circ \hat p_I = p \circ \widehat\Pi_I$ *for any* $\phi_I \in \Gamma_I$.

(vii) $\hat p_J \circ \widehat\Pi^I_J = \hat\pi^I_J \circ \hat p_I$ *for any* $J \subset I \in \mathcal N$.

(viii) *For any* $L, J, I \in \mathcal N$ *with* $L \subset J \subset I$ *it holds that* $\hat\pi^J_L \circ \hat\pi^I_J = \hat\pi^I_L$ *and* $\widehat\Pi^J_L \circ \widehat\Pi^I_J = \widehat\Pi^I_L$.

The final (vii) may easily follow from (3.45) and (3.54). We get a system of PS Banach bundles

$$\big(\widehat{\mathcal E}^\Gamma, \widehat W^\Gamma\big) = \Big\{\big(\widehat E^{\Gamma_I}_I, \widehat W^{\Gamma_I}_I\big), \hat\pi_I, \widehat\Pi_I, \Gamma_I, \hat\pi^I_J, \widehat\Pi^I_J, \lambda^I_J \;\Big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal N\Big\}, \tag{3.61}$$

which is called a *desingularization* of the bundle system $\big(\widetilde{\mathcal E}^\Gamma, \widetilde W^\Gamma\big)$.

As in [LiuT1] we may take the pairs of Γ_i-invariant open sets $W^j_i \subset\subset U^j_i$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_3 - 1$, such that

$$U^1_i \subset\subset W^2_i \subset\subset U^2_i \cdots \subset\subset W^{n_3-1}_i \subset\subset U^{n_3-1}_i \subset\subset W^{n_3}_i = W_i.$$

Note that each $I \in \mathcal N$ has length $|I| < n_3$. For each $I \in \mathcal N$ we define

$$V_I = (\cap_{i\in I} W^k_i) \setminus Cl(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\cap_{j\in J} Cl(U^k_j))). \tag{3.62}$$

Then the second condition in (3.20) implies

$$V_I = W_I \quad \forall I \in \mathcal N \ \text{ with } |I| = n_3 - 1.$$

For $\{V_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal N\}$, unlike $\{W_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal N\}$ we cannot guarantee that $V_I \subset V_J$ even if $J \subset I$. However we have still the corresponding result with Lemma 4.3 in [LiuT1].

Lemma 3.11. $\{V_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal N\}$ *is an open covering of* $\cup^{n_3}_{i=1} W^1_i$ *and satisfies:*

(i) *$V_I \subset W_I$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$.*

(ii) *$Cl(V_I) \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$ only if $I \subset J$ or $J \subset I$. (Actually $Cl(V_I) \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$ implies $V_I \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$, and thus $Cl(V_I) \cap V_J = \emptyset$ for any $I, J \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = |J| = n_3 - 1$.)*

(iii) *For any nonempty open subset $\mathcal{W}^* \subset \cup_{i=1}^{n_3} W_i^1$ and $I \in \mathcal{N}$ let $W_I^* = W_I \cap \mathcal{W}^*$ and $V_I^* = V_I \cap \mathcal{W}^*$. Then $\{V_I^* \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is an open covering of $\mathcal{W}^*$, and also satisfies the above corresponding properties (i)-(ii).*

Proof. Step 1. Let $\mathcal{N}_k = \{I \in \mathcal{N} \,|\, |I| = k\}$, $k = 1, \cdots, n_3 - 1$. We first prove that $\{V_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is an open covering of $\cup_{i=1}^{n_3} W_i^1$. It is easy to see that for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$,

$$V_I = \Big(\bigcap_{i \in I} W_i^k\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{N}_{k+1}} \big(\bigcap_{j \in J} Cl(U_j^k)\big)\Big). \tag{3.63}$$

For $x \in W_i$, set $I_1 = \{i\}$. If $x \in V_{I_1}$ nothing is done. Otherwise, there is $J_1 \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|J_1| = 2$ such that $x \in \cap_{j \in J_1} Cl(U_j^1) \subset W_{J_1}^2$. Set $I_2 = I_1 \cup J_1$ then $x \in W_{I_1}^1 \cap W_{J_1}^2 \subset W_{I_1}^2 \cap W_{J_1}^2$ and thus

$$x \in W_{I_2}^2 \subset W_{I_2}^{|I_2|}, \ |I_2| \geq |J_1| = |I_1| + 1 = 2.$$

If $x \in V_{I_2}$ then nothing is done. Otherwise, because of (3.62) there is $J_2 \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|J_2| = |I_2| + 1$ such that $x \in \cap_{j \in J_2} Cl(U_j^{|I_2|}) \subset W_{J_2}^{|J_2|}$. Set $I_3 = I_2 \cup J_2$ then $x \in W_{I_2}^2 \cap W_{J_2}^{|J_2|} \subset W_{I_2}^{|I_3|} \cap W_{J_2}^{|I_3|}$ and thus

$$x \in W_{I_3}^{|I_3|}, \ |I_3| \geq |J_2| = |I_2| + 1 \geq 3.$$

After repeating finite times this process there must exist some $I_k \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $x \in V_{I_k}$ because $V_I = W_I^{n_3 - 1}$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = n_3 - 1$. The desired conclusion is proved.

Step 2. We prove (i) and (ii). (i) is obvious. We only need to prove (ii). Let $Cl(V_I) \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$ for two different $I, J \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| = k$ and $|J| = l$. Since $I = \{1, \cdots, n_3\} \notin \mathcal{N}$ we can assume that $n_3 > k \geq l$ below. Suppose that there exists a $r \in J \setminus I$. Let $x \in Cl(V_I) \cap V_J$. Take a sequence $\{x_k\} \subset V_I$ such that $x_k \to x$. Since V_J is open then $x_k \in V_J$ for k sufficiently large. So $V_I \cap V_J \neq \emptyset$ and we may assume that $x \in V_I \cap V_J$. Now one hand $x \in V_J$ implies that

$$x \in Cl\big(\cap_{i \in J} W_i^l\big) \subset Cl\big(\cap_{i \in J} W_i^k\big) \subset Cl(W_r^k).$$

On the other hand $x \in V_I$ implies that x does not belong to

$$\begin{aligned} \cap_{i \in I} Cl(U_i^k) \cap Cl(U_r^k) &\supseteq \cap_{i \in I} Cl(W_i^k) \cap Cl(W_r^k) \\ &\supseteq Cl(\cap_{i \in I} W_i^k) \cap Cl(W_r^k). \end{aligned}$$

So $x \notin Cl(W_r^k)$ because $x \in V_I \subset Cl\big(\cap_{i \in I} W_i^k\big)$. This contradiction shows that $J \subset I$.

Step 3. Note that $Cl(V_I^*) \cap V_J^* \subset Cl(V_I) \cap V_J \cap \mathcal{W}^*$ for any $I, J \in \mathcal{N}$. The desired conclusions follow immediately. □

Set

$$\widehat{V}_I = (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(V_I) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{E}_I = (\widehat{\Pi}_I)^{-1}(E_I|_{V_I}), \tag{3.64}$$

For $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$, though $\hat{\pi}^I_J(\widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I) \subset \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_J}_J$ we cannot guarantee that $\hat{\pi}^I_J(\widehat{V}_I) \subset \widehat{V}_J$. So $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ only defines a PS map from the open subset $(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J) \cap \widehat{V}_I$ to $\widehat{V}_J$. However, we still denote by $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ the restriction of $\hat{\pi}^I_J$ to $(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J) \cap \widehat{V}_I$. In this case it holds that

$$\hat{\pi}_J \circ \hat{\pi}^I_J = \iota^V_{IJ} \circ \hat{\pi}_I \tag{3.65}$$

for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\iota^V_{IJ} : V_I \cap V_J \hookrightarrow V_J$ is the inclusion. Similarly, $\widehat{\Pi}^I_J$ denote the restriction of $\widehat{\Pi}^I_J$ to $(\widehat{\Pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{E}_J) \cap \widehat{E}_I$. Since the bundle projection $\hat{p}_I : \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ in (3.52) maps $\widehat{E}_I$ to $\widehat{V}_I$ we still use $\hat{p}_I$ to denote the bundle projection $\widehat{E}_I \to \widehat{V}_I$. The system of stratified Banach bundles

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{V}) = \big\{(\widehat{E}_I, \widehat{V}_I), \pi_I, \pi^I_J, \widehat{\Pi}_I, \widehat{\Pi}^I_J, p_I, \Gamma_I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}, \tag{3.66}$$

is called *renormalization* of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\Gamma, \widehat{W}^\Gamma)$.

A *global section* of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\Gamma, \widehat{W}^\Gamma)$ (resp. $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{V})$) is a compatible collection $S = \{S_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of sections S_I of $\widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ (resp. $\widehat{E}_I \to \widehat{V}_I$) in the sense that $(\widehat{\Pi}^I_J)^* S_J = S_I$, i.e., $S_J(\hat{\pi}^I_J(x)) = \widehat{\Pi}^I_J(S_I(x))$ for any $x \in \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ (resp. $(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(\widehat{V}_J) \cap \widehat{V}_I$)) and $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$. As before S is said to be *partially smooth* if each S_I is continuous and stratawise smooth. Such a section S is called *transversal* to the zero section if each S_I is so.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $I_l = \{l\}$ for $1 \le l \le n_3$. For $I \in \mathcal{N}$ with $|I| > 1$, and $l \in I$ each PS section $\tilde{\sigma}_l : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l$ can define a PS section of the bundle $\hat{p}_I : \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I$ by*

$$\hat{\sigma}_{lI} : \widehat{W}^{\Gamma_I}_I \to \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_I}_I,\ \hat{x} \mapsto \big((\widehat{\Pi}^I_{I_l})^* \tilde{\sigma}_l\big)(\hat{x}) =: (\widehat{\Pi}^I_{I_l}|_{(\widehat{E}_I)_{\hat{x}}})^{-1}\big(\tilde{\sigma}_l(\hat{\pi}^I_{I_l}(\hat{x}))\big) \tag{3.67}$$

which is equal to $\tilde{\sigma}_l$ if $I = I_l$. In particular, if $\tilde{\sigma}_l : \widetilde{W}_l \to \widetilde{E}_l$ has the support contained in $\widetilde{W}_l$ (i.e., $\pi_l(\{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{W}_l \,|\, \tilde{\sigma}_l(x) \ne 0\}) \subset\subset W_l$) then for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ it may determine a PS section $(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I$ of the bundle $\widehat{E}_I \to \widehat{V}_I$ even if $l \notin I$, and these PS sections give rise to a global PS section $\hat{\sigma}_l = \{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I : I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}, \widehat{V})$.

Proof. To see that the section $\hat{\sigma}_{lI}$ defined by (3.67) is partially smooth let us write it in the charts in (3.44) and (3.53) with $s = 1$. Let $\hat{x} = \widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I}(\tilde{x}_{i_1}) = [\tilde{u}_I, \phi_I, \phi_I \circ \lambda^1_I(\tilde{x}_{i_1})]$ for $\tilde{x}_{i_1} \in O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})$. Then $\hat{\pi}^I_{I_l}(\hat{x}) = [\tilde{u}_l, \phi_l, \phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x}_{i_1})] = \phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x}_{i_1})$, and in particular $\hat{\pi}^I_{I_l}(\hat{x}) = \tilde{x}_{i_1}$ if $l = i_1$. So $\tilde{\sigma}_l(\phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x}_{i_1})) = \langle \tilde{u}_l, \phi_l, \tilde{\sigma}_l(\phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x}_{i_1}))\rangle$. Under the bundle charts $\widehat{\Phi_I \circ \Lambda^1_I}$ in (3.53) and

$$\widehat{\Phi_{I_l} \circ \Lambda^1_{I_l}} : \widetilde{E}_l|_{O(\tilde{u}_l)} \to \widehat{E}^{\Gamma_{I_l}}_{I_l},\ \tilde{\eta} \mapsto \langle \tilde{u}_{I_l}, \phi_{I_l}, \Phi_{I_l} \circ \Lambda^1_{I_l}(\tilde{\eta})\rangle = \langle \tilde{u}_l, \phi_l, \tilde{\eta}\rangle = \tilde{\eta},$$

we can derive from (3.55) and (3.56) that the projection $\hat{\Pi}^I_{I_l}$ may be represented by

$$\widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})} \to \widetilde{E}_l|_{O(\tilde{u}_l)},\ \tilde{\xi}_{i_1} \mapsto \Phi_l \circ \Lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{\xi}_{i_1}).$$

It follows that $\hat{\sigma}_{lI}$ may locally be represented as

$$O(\tilde{u}_{i_1}) \to \widetilde{E}_{i_1}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_1})},\ \tilde{x}_{i_1} \mapsto (\Phi_l \circ \Lambda_{i_1 l})^{-1}\big(\tilde{\sigma}_l(\phi_l \circ \lambda_{i_1 l}(\tilde{x}_{i_1}))\big). \tag{3.68}$$

This shows that $\hat{\sigma}_{lI}$ is partially smooth.

Next we prove the second claim. For $I=\{i_1,\cdots,i_k\}\in\mathcal{N}$, if $l\notin I$, (3.63) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
V_I\quad &=\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I}W_i^k\Big)\setminus\Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|=k+1}(\bigcap_{j\in J}Cl(U_j^k))\Big)\\
&\subset\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I}W_i^k\Big)\setminus\Big((\bigcap_{i\in I}Cl(U_i^k))\cap Cl(U_l^k)\Big)\\
&\subset\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I}W_i^k\Big)\setminus\Big((\bigcap_{i\in I}Cl(U_i^k))\cap Cl(W_l^1)\Big)\\
&=\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I}W_i^k\Big)\setminus Cl(W_l^1)\\
&\subset\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I}Cl(W_i^k)\Big)\setminus W_l^1
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inclusion is because $W_l^1\subset U_l^1\subset U_l^k$, and the second equality comes from the fact that $\cap_{i\in I}W_i^k\subset\cap_{i\in I}U_i^k$.

It follows that

$$Cl(V_I)\subset\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I}Cl(W_i^k)\Big)\setminus W_l^1$$

since the left side is closed. Moreover, $\pi_l(\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{\sigma}_l))\subset W_l^1$.

We get that

$$\pi_l(\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{\sigma}_l))\cap Cl(V_I)=\emptyset\quad\forall l\notin I,\,1\le l\le n_3.\tag{3.69}$$

Note that $\widehat{V}_{I_l}\subset\widehat{W}_{I_l}=\widetilde{W}_l$. For $I\in\mathcal{N}$ we define

$$\begin{cases}(\hat{\sigma}_l)_{I_l}=\tilde{\sigma}_l|_{\widehat{V}_{I_l}},(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I=0\text{ if }l\notin I,\text{ and}\\ (\hat{\sigma}_l)_I:=\hat{\sigma}_{lI}|_{\widehat{V}_I}\text{ if }l\in I\text{ and }|I|>1.\end{cases}$$

By the local expression in (3.68) they are partially smooth. Clearly, the collection $\{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I:I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ is compatible in the sense that $(\widehat{\Pi}_J^I)^*(\hat{\sigma}_l)_J=(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I$ for any $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$. Hence $\hat{\sigma}_l=\{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I:I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ is a PS global section of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$. □

Remark 3.13. For each $i=1,\cdots,n_3$ let W_i^+ be a slight larger open set than W_i with $W_i\subset\subset W_i^+$. For each $i=1,\cdots,n_3$ let us take pairs of open subsets $W_i^{+j}\subset\subset U_i^{+j}$, $j=1,\cdots,n_3-1$ such that

$$W_i^j\subset\subset W_i^{+j}\subset\subset U_i^{+j}\subset\subset U_i^j,\ j=1,\cdots,n_3-1.$$

Then for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$ with $|I|=k$ we follow (3.62) to define

$$V_I^+:=\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I}W_i^{+k}\Big)\setminus\Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k}(\bigcap_{j\in J}Cl(U_j^{+k}))\Big)$$

and thus get a system of stratified Banach bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{\Gamma^+},\widehat{W}^{\Gamma^+})$ and its renormalization $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^+,\widehat{V}^+)$. For any section $\tilde{\sigma}_l:\widetilde{W}_l\to\widetilde{E}_l$ with $\pi_l(\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{\sigma}_l))\subset W_l$, which is naturally viewed a section $\tilde{\sigma}_l:\widetilde{W}_l^+\to\widetilde{E}_l^+$, the same reason as above may yield a global PS section $\hat{\sigma}_l^+=\{(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I^+:I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^+,\widehat{V}^+)$ which restricts to $\hat{\sigma}_l$ on $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$. Actually, $(\hat{\sigma}_l)_I^+$ vanishes outside

$\widehat{V}_I\subset\widehat{V}^+_I$. Note that $Cl(V_I)\subset V^+_I$ for any $I\in\mathcal{N}$. We may consider the closure of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$ in $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^+,\widehat{V}^+)$,

$$(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}),Cl(\widehat{V}))=\big\{(Cl(\widehat{E}_I),Cl(\widehat{V}_I)),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\widehat{\Pi}_I,\widehat{\Pi}^I_J,\hat{p}_I,\Gamma_I\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\}$$

and define its global section by requiring that $S_J(\hat{\pi}^I_J(x))=\widehat{\Pi}^I_J(S_I(x))$ for $x\in(\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}(Cl(\widehat{V}_J))\cap Cl(\widehat{V}_I)$ and $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$. In this case the above section $\hat{\sigma}_l$ produced by a section $\tilde{\sigma}_l:\widetilde{W}_l\to\widetilde{E}_l$ with $\pi_l(\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{\sigma}_l))\subset W_l$ can naturally be extended into a global section of $(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}),Cl(\widehat{V}))$ (by the zero extension), still denoted by $\hat{\sigma}_l$ without confusions. Later when we need to use $(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}),Cl(\widehat{V}))$ we assume that we have taken a $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^+,\widehat{W}^+)$ to contain it.

It is not difficult to check that the Cauchy-Riemann operator may define a global PS section $\hat{\partial}_J=\{(\hat{\partial}_J)_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\Gamma,\widehat{W}^\Gamma)$ (resp. $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$ and $(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}),Cl(\widehat{V}))$). In particular, from (3.45) and (3.54) it follows that

$$(\hat{\partial}_J)_L\circ\hat{\pi}^I_L=\widehat{\Pi}^I_L\circ(\hat{\partial}_J)_I \tag{3.70}$$

for any $L\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$. In the charts of (3.44) and (3.53) the section $(\hat{\partial}_J)_I$ may be expressed as

$$O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\to\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})},\ \mathbf{f}=(f,\Sigma,\bar{z})\mapsto\bar{\partial}_J f. \tag{3.71}$$

So $(\hat{\partial}_J)_I$ is partially smooth, and its zero set is given by

$$\mathcal{Z}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I)=(\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}\big(Z(\bar{\partial}_J)\cap W_I\big).$$

Since $Z(\bar{\partial}_J)\cap Cl(V_I)$ is compact (as a subset of V^+_I by Remark 3.13), so is

$$\mathcal{VZ}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I):=(\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}\big(Z(\bar{\partial}_J)\cap Cl(V_I)\big)\subset\widehat{V}^+_I.$$

Let $\tilde{s}_{ij}$, $j=1,\cdots,q_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n_3$, be the sections satisfying (3.21) and Lemma 3.3. By Lemma 3.12 each $\tilde{s}_{ij}$ determines a global PS section $\hat{s}_{ij}=\{(\hat{s}_{ij})_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$. It follows from Remark 3.13 that $\hat{s}_{ij}$ can also be viewed a global PS section of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^+,\widehat{V}^+)$. This and finiteness of $\mathcal{N}$ imply that there exists a constant $C>0$ and an open neighborhood $U(\mathcal{VZ}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I))$ of $\mathcal{VZ}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I)$ in $\widehat{W}^+_I$ such that

$$\|(\hat{s}_{ij})_I(x)\|\le C\ \forall x\in U\big(\mathcal{VZ}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I)\big)\cap\widehat{V}^+_I. \tag{3.72}$$

Here the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is defined by (3.57). Note that $U\big(\mathcal{VZ}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I)\big)\cap\widehat{V}_I$ is an open subset in $\widehat{V}_I$ and that the union $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(U\big(\mathcal{VZ}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I)\big)\cap\widehat{V}_I)$ is still an open neighborhood of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3)$ in $\mathcal{W}$. Take an open neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3)$ in $\mathcal{W}$ so that it is contained in the intersection of $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(U\big(\mathcal{VZ}((\hat{\partial}_J)_I)\big)\cap\widehat{V}_I)$ and $\cup_{i=1}^{n_3}V^0_i$ in (3.20). Set

$$V^*_I:=V_I\cap\mathcal{W}^*,\quad \widehat{V}^*_I=(\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(V^*_I)\quad\text{and}\quad\widehat{E}^*_I=(\widehat{\Pi}_I)^{-1}(E_I|_{V^*_I}). \tag{3.73}$$

As above we get a stratified Banach bundle system

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*,\widehat{V}^*)=\big\{(\widehat{E}^*_I,\widehat{V}^*_I),\hat{\pi}_I,\hat{\pi}^I_J,\widehat{\Pi}_I,\widehat{\Pi}^I_J,\hat{p}_I,\Gamma_I\;\big|\;J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}\big\}, \tag{3.74}$$

which is called the *restriction* of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$ to the open subset $\mathcal{W}^*\subset\mathcal{W}$. Similarly, we can define its global section. Clearly, each global section $\hat{\sigma}=\{(\hat{\sigma})_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}},\widehat{V})$ may restrict to a global section of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*, \widehat{V}^*)$, $\hat{\sigma}|_{\widehat{V}^*} = \{(\hat{\sigma})_I|_{\widehat{V}^*_I}\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$. As in Remark 3.13 we may also consider the closure of $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*, \widehat{V}^*)$ in $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{\Gamma^+}, \widehat{W}^{\Gamma^+})$,

$$(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*), Cl(\widehat{V}^*)) = \big\{(Cl(\widehat{E}^*_I), Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)), \hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \widehat{\Pi}_I, \widehat{\Pi}^I_J, p_I, \Gamma_I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$$

and define its global section.

Denote by $q = q_1 + \cdots + q_{n_3}$. Taking $0 < \eta \le \min\{\eta_i\,|\,1 \le i \le n_3\}$, we have the obvious pullback stratified Banach bundle system

$$\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*, \widehat{V}^* \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)\big) = \big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{E}^*_I, \widehat{V}^*_I \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)), \pi_I, \pi^I_J, \Pi_I, \Pi^I_J, p_I, \Gamma_I \;\big|\; J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}, \quad (3.75)$$

where $\mathbf{P}_1$ are the projections to the first factor, and $\hat{\pi}_I, \hat{\pi}^I_J, \hat{\Pi}_I, \hat{\Pi}^I_J, \hat{p}_I$ are naturally pullbacks of those projections in (3.74). Consider its global section $\Psi = \{\Psi_I\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\Psi_I : \widehat{V}^*_I \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q) \to \mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{E}^*_I,\ (\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto (\hat{\partial}_J)_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_3}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij}(\hat{s}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I), \quad (3.76)$$

where $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}|1 \le j \le q_i,\, 1 \le i \le n_3\} \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Clearly, $\Psi_I(\hat{x}_I, 0) = 0$ for any zero $\hat{x}_I$ of $(\hat{\partial}_J)_I$ in $\widehat{V}_I$.

Theorem 3.14. *If the above $\eta > 0$ is small enough, then the global section $\Psi = \big\{\Psi_I\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$ is transversal the zero section at each zero $(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in \widehat{V}^*_I \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$. So for each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ the set*

$$\widehat{\Omega}_I(K_0, \eta) := \{(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in \widehat{V}^*_I \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)\,|\, \Psi_I(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) = 0\}$$

is a stratified manifold of top dimension $2m + 2c_1(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + q$. Moreover, for any $J \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$ the projection

$$\hat{\pi}^I_J : (\hat{\pi}^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\Omega}_I(K_0, \eta)\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(\hat{\pi}^I_J) \subset \widehat{\Omega}_J(K_0, \eta)$$

is a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$-fold PS covering.

Proof. We may extend Ψ_I on $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I) \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ naturally, still denoted by Ψ_I. Let $(\hat{u}_I, \mathbf{t}^0) \in Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I) \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ be a zero of Ψ_I. Then $u_I = \hat{\pi}_I(\hat{u}_I) \in \cup_{i=1}^{n_3} V^0_i$, and by the choice of $\mathcal{W}^*$ above it sits in $V^0_{i_s} \subset W_{i_s}$ for some $i_s \in I$. By (3.49) let $\tilde{u}_I = q_I(\hat{u}_I)$ and denote by $\tilde{u}_{i_s}$ the s-th component of $\tilde{u}_I$. Then in the chart $\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I}$ in (3.44) we have $\hat{u}_I = \widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$. Note that

$$\Psi_I(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) = (\hat{\partial}_J)_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i \in I}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij}(\hat{s}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I)$$

for any $(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in \widehat{V}_I \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$. In the charts of (3.44) and (3.53), (3.71) gives the local expression of the section $(\hat{\partial}_J)_I$, and as in (3.68) for each $i \in I$ and $j = 1, \cdots, q_i$ we have also one of $(\hat{s}_{ij})_I$,

$$O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \to \widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})},\ \tilde{x} \mapsto \tau_{ij}(\tilde{x}) := (\Phi_i \circ \Lambda_{i_s i})^{-1}\big(\tilde{s}_{ij}(\phi_i \circ \lambda_{i_s i}(\tilde{x}))\big).$$

Hereafter we need to shrink $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})$ so that $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s}) \subset (\widehat{\phi_I \circ \lambda^s_I})^{-1}(\widehat{V}_I) \subset \widetilde{U}^0_{i_s}$. Using these we can get the following local expression of Ψ_I in the natural pullback charts,

$$\begin{aligned}
&O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)\to \mathbf{P}_1^*(\widetilde{E}_{i_s}|_{O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})}),\\
&(\tilde{x},\mathbf{t})\mapsto \bar{\partial}_J(\tilde{x})+\sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij}\tau_{ij}(\tilde{x})\\
&=\bar{\partial}_J(\tilde{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{q_{i_s}} t_{i_sj}\tilde{s}_{i_sj}(\tilde{x})+\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_s\}}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij}\tau_{ij}(\tilde{x}).
\end{aligned}\tag{3.77}$$

Let $\tilde{u}_{i_s}\in \widetilde{V}^0_{i_s}\cap \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{i_s}$ for some $|(u,v)|\le \delta(\epsilon^{(i_s)}_{\mathbf{f}})$. By Lemma 3.3 we have the trivialization representative of the restriction of the section in (3.77) to $O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\cap \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{i_s}\times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\cap \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{i_s})\times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)\to L^p_{k-1}(f^{(i_s)*}_{(u,v)}TM),\\
&(\tilde{x};\mathbf{t})\mapsto F^{(i_s)}_{(u,v)}(\tilde{x})+\sum_{j=1}^{q_{i_s}} t_{i_sj}s^{(u,v)}_{i_sj}(\tilde{x})+\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_s\}}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij}\tau^{(u,v)}_{ij}(\tilde{x}),
\end{aligned}\tag{3.78}$$

where $\tau^{(u,v)}_{ij}$ are the corresponding trivialization representatives of the sections τ_{ij} under (3.2). Now the tangent map of the map in (3.78) at $(\tilde{u}_{i_s},\mathbf{t}^0)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_{\tilde{u}_{i_s}}(O(\tilde{u}_{i_s})\cap \widetilde{W}^{(u,v)}_{i_s})\times \mathbb{R}^q\to L^p_{k-1}(f^{(i_s)*}_{(u,v)}TM),\\
&(\tilde{\xi},\mathbf{v})\mapsto dF^{(i_s)}_{(u,v)}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})(\tilde{\xi})+\sum_{j=1}^{q_{i_s}} v_{i_sj}s^{(u,v)}_{i_sj}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})+\sum_{j=1}^{q_{i_s}} t^0_{i_sj}ds^{(u,v)}_{i_sj}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})(\tilde{\xi})\\
&\qquad+\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_s\}}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} v_{ij}\tau^{(u,v)}_{ij}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})+\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_s\}}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t^0_{ij}d\tau^{(u,v)}_{ij}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})(\tilde{\xi}).
\end{aligned}\tag{3.79}$$

Since $Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)\subset \widehat{V}^+_I\subset \widehat{W}^+_I$ it follows from (3.76) that

$$\mathcal{Z}\big((\hat{\partial}_J)_I|_{Cl(\widehat{V}^*_I)}\big)=(\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}\big(Z(\bar{\partial}_J)\cap Cl(V^*_I)\big)$$

is compact in $\widehat{W}^+_I$ for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$. Note that $ds^{(u,v)}_{i_sj}(\tilde{u}_{i_s})=0$, $j=1,\cdots,q_{i_s}$. As in Lemma 3.1 we can use this fact, (3.6), (3.14) and (3.15) to prove that the map in (3.79) is surjective for $\eta>0$ and $\mathcal{W}^*$ sufficiently small. Then the standard arguments can complete the proof. □

Since $\mathcal{N}$ is a finite set and each $\widehat{V}^*_I$ (and thus $\widehat{\Omega}_I$) has only finitely many strata, Theorem 3.14 and the Sard-Smale theorem immediately gives:

Corollary 3.15. *There exists a residual subset* $\mathbf{B}^{res}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)\subset \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *such that for each* $\mathbf{t}\in \mathbf{B}^{res}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *the global section* $\Psi^{(\mathbf{t})}=\{\Psi^{(\mathbf{t})}_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ *of the PS bundle system* $\big(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*,\widehat{V}^*)\big)$ *is transversal the zero section, where* $\Psi^{(\mathbf{t})}_I:\widehat{V}^*_I\to \widehat{E}^*_I$, $\hat{x}_I\mapsto \Psi_I(\hat{x}_I,\mathbf{t})$. *Therefore the set* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0):=(\Psi^{(\mathbf{t})}_I)^{-1}(0)$ *is a stratified Banach manifold of dimension* $2m+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)$. *It also holds that*

- **(i)** *The stratified Banach manifolds* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ *has no strata of codimension odd, and each stratum of* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ *of codimension* r *is exactly the intersection of* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ *and the stratum of* $\widehat{V}^*_I$ *of codimension* r *for* $r=0,\cdots,2m+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)$.

(ii) *The family* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ *is compatible in the sense that for any* $J\subset I\in\mathcal{N}$,

$$\hat\pi^I_J : (\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\big)\to \mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(K_0) \tag{3.80}$$

is a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$*-fold partially smooth covering.*

(iii) *For each* $I\in\mathcal{N}$ *and any two* $\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}'\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q)$*, the cornered stratified Banach manifolds* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ *and* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(K_0)$ *are cobordant, and thus maps* $\hat\pi_I:\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to\mathcal{W}^*$ *and* $\hat\pi_I:\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}'}_I(K_0)\to\mathcal{W}^*$ *are also cobordant.*

We can also show that each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ carries a natural orientation and all $\hat\pi^I_J$ perverse the orientations, cf., [LuT] for details. By the definition of V_I^* in (3.73) it follows from (3.72) that

$$\|(\hat s_{ij})_I(x)\|\le C\ \forall x\in \widehat{V}_I^* \tag{3.81}$$

and $i=1,\cdots,n_3$, $j=1,\cdots,q_i$. To understand the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)=\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ we first consider the case that M is a closed manifold.

Proposition 3.16. *If* M *is a closed symplectic manifold, we may take* $K_0=M$ *and* $i=1,\cdots,n_0$ *in the construction above. Using some ideas in the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [LiuT1] we can derive from (3.81) and the compactness of*

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)=\bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\mathcal{Z}\big((\hat\partial_J)_I|_{\widehat{V}_I^*}\big)) \tag{3.82}$$

that for any given small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ *of* $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$ *there exists a small* $\delta>0$ *such that the closure of* $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))$ *may be contained in* $\mathcal{U}$ *for any* $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}_\delta(\mathbb{R}^q)$*. In particular there exists a positive number* $\varepsilon\le\eta$ *such that* $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))$ *is compact for each* $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$*. Consequently, the family* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)=\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ *is "like" an open cover of an oriented closed manifold. Especially, each* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ *is a finite set provided that* $2m+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)=0$*. The formal summation*

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}:=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to\mathcal{W}\}\quad \forall\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q),$$

gives rise to a family of cobordant singular cycles in $\mathcal{W}$*, called the* virtual moduli cycles *in* $\mathcal{W}$ *(cf. [LiuT1, LiuT2, LiuT3]). As explained on page 65 of [LiuT1] the summation precisely means that on the overlap of two pieces* $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ *we only count them once. Hereafter we omit the wide hat* $\widehat{\ }$ *over* $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I$ *and the dependence marks on* ω, J,μ *and* A *without occurring of confusions.*

Proof. Since $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V_I^*$ is an open neighborhood of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A)$ in $\mathcal{W}$ we can take a positive $\varepsilon\le\eta$ such that the closure of $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))$ is contained in $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V_I^*$ for any $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$. We shall prove that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))$ is compact for any $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$. By the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [LiuT1] each $\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))$ has the compact closure in $\mathcal{W}$. So the compact subset $Cl\big(\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))\big)=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}Cl\big(\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))\big)$ is contained in the open subset $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V_I^*$. Note that any given point $x\in Cl\big(\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))\big)\setminus\hat\pi_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0))\subset Cl(V_I^*)$ may be contained in some V_L^*. So $Cl(V_I)\cap V_L\ne\emptyset$. It follows from (ii) in Lemma 3.11 that $I\subset L$ or $L\subset I$. Let $I\subset L$ and $x=\hat\pi_L(\hat x_L)$ for some $\hat x_L\in\widehat{V}_L^*$. By Remark 3.13 we may assume $x=\hat\pi_I(\hat x_I)$ for some

$\hat{x}_I \in Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*)$. Since $\Psi^{(\mathbf{t})} = \{\Psi_I^{(\mathbf{t})}\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$ may be extended into a global section of the PS bundle system $\big(Cl(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*), Cl(\widehat{V}^*)\big)$ naturally, we get that $\Psi_I^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_I) = 0$. Since $\hat{\pi}_I^L(\hat{x}_L) = \hat{x}_I$, $\Psi_L^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_L) = 0$ and thus $x \in \hat{\pi}_L(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_L^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))$. This shows that $Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))\big) \subset \cup_{J\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_J(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))$. For the case $L \subset I$ we have $\hat{\pi}_L^I(\hat{x}_I) = \hat{x}_L$. It follows from $\Psi_I^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_I) = 0$ that $\Psi_L^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_L) = 0$. Hence it also holds that $x = \hat{\pi}_L(\hat{x}_L) \in \hat{\pi}_L(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_L^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))$. In summary we obtain that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))\big) \subset \cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))$ and hence $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)) = \cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} Cl\big(\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))\big)$ is compact.

If $2m + 2c_1(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) = 0$ then each $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ is a manifold of dimension zero. Assume that it contains infinitely many points $\hat{x}^{(k)}$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. We may assume that $\{\hat{\pi}_I(\hat{x}^{(k)})\}$ converges to some $[\mathbf{f}] \in \hat{\pi}_L\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_L^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)\big)$ because $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))$ is compact. Note that inverse image of each point by $\hat{\pi}_I$ contains at most $|\Gamma_I|$ points and that $\{\hat{\pi}_I(\hat{x}^{(k)})\}$ are contained in the closed subset $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*) \subset \widehat{W}_I^{\Gamma_I}$. After passing a subsequence we may assume that $\{\hat{x}^{(k)}\}$ converges to some $\hat{x}_I \in Cl\big(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)\big)$. Then $\Psi_I^{(\mathbf{t})}(\hat{x}_I) = 0$. As showed at the end of proof of Theorem 3.14 the section $\Psi_I^{(\mathbf{t})}$ is still transversal to the zero section near $\hat{x}_I$ in $Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*)$. This destroys the manifold structure of $\mathcal{Z}\big((\hat{\partial}_J)_I|_{Cl(\widehat{V}_I^*)}\big)$. The desired conclusion is proved. □

In the case (3.82) does not hold. However, (3.19) and (3.20) imply that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3) = \Big\{[\mathbf{f}] \in \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \hat{\pi}_I\big(\mathcal{Z}\big((\hat{\partial}_J)_I|_{\widehat{V}_I^*}\big)\big) \;\Big|\; Im(f)\cap K_3 \ne \emptyset\Big\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$Im(f) \subset K_4 \;\forall [\mathbf{f}] \in \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \hat{\pi}_I\big(\mathcal{Z}\big((\hat{\partial}_J)_I|_{\widehat{V}_I^*}\big)\big).$$

Using (3.81) and the compactness of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3)$ we can, as above, prove:

Proposition 3.17. *For any given small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A,K_3)$ there exists a small $\delta > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}_\delta(\mathbb{R}^q)$,*

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3) := \Big\{[\mathbf{f}] \in \cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)) \;\Big|\; Im(f)\cap K_3 \ne \emptyset\Big\} \subset \mathcal{U}.$$

In particular there exists a positive constant $\varepsilon \le \eta$ such that for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ the following hold:
(i) The closure of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3)$ is contained in $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V_I^*$.
(ii) For any $[\mathbf{f}] \in Cl\big((\hat{\pi}_I(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))\big)$ either $[\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3)$ or $Im(f)\cap K_3 = \emptyset$. Especially $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3)$ is compact.

In the present case the family $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0) = \big\{\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$ is "like" an open cover of an open submanifold of an oriented geometrically bounded manifold. But the corresponding formal summation

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0) := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I : \mathcal{M}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0) \to \mathcal{W}^*\} \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon^{res}(\mathbb{R}^q), \tag{3.83}$$

gives rise to a family of cobordant singular chains in $\mathcal{W}^*$ in general. We call it a *virtual moduli chain* in $\mathcal{W}$. However, it can still be used to define our GW-invariants in next section.

4 Gromov-Witten invariants

In the first subsection we shall define our Gromov-Witten invariants and prove their simple properties. In §4.2 − §4.6 we shall prove in details the independence of our invariants for various choices.

4.1 Definition and simple properties

From now on we always assume that (M,ω) is noncompact and geometrically bounded. For $\mathbb{K}=\mathbb{C},\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ let $H^{\rm II}_*(M,\mathbb{K})$ be the *singular homology of the second kind* (or the homology based on infinite locally finite singular chains), and $H^*(M,\mathbb{K})$ (resp. $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{K})$) denote the singular cohomology (resp. the singular cohomology with compact supports) with coefficients in $\mathbb{K}$. (see [Sc, Sk]). By the deRham theorem we may also consider $H^*(M,\mathbb{K})$ (resp. $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{K})$) as the deRham cohomology (resp. the deRham cohomology with compact support) with coefficients in $\mathbb{K}$. In particular $H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ (resp. $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$) consists of all deRham cohomology classes in $H^*(M,\mathbb{R})$ (resp. $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{R})$) which take rational values over all integral cycles. One has the Poincaré duality isomorphisms

$$PD: H_p(M,\mathbb{K})\to H^{n-p}_c(M,\mathbb{K})\quad\text{and}\quad PD^{\rm II}: H^{\rm II}_p(M,\mathbb{K})\to H^{n-p}(M,\mathbb{K}).$$

The orientation determines a class $[M]\in H^{\rm II}_{2n}(M,\mathbb{Z})$, which is Poincaŕe dual to $\mathbf{1}\in H^0(M,\mathbb{Z})$, also called the *fundamental cohomology class.*

Consider the evaluation maps

$${\rm EV}_{g,m}=(\prod_{i=1}^m{\rm ev}_i):\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}\to M^m\quad\text{and}\quad \Pi_{g,m}:\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},$$

where ${\rm ev}_i([f,\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}])=f(z_i)$, $i=1,\cdots,m$ and $\Pi_{g,m}([f,\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}])=[\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}']$ is obtained by collapsing components of $(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ with genus 0 and at most two special points.

Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le m}\subset H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})\cup H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$, and at least one of them, saying α_1, belong to $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$. Later, if $\alpha_i\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ (resp. $H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$) we understand the Poincaŕe duality of it to sit in $H_*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ (resp. $H^{\rm II}_*(M,\mathbb{Q})$.) Let $\bar{\alpha_i}:C(\alpha_i)\to M$ be the representative cycle of the Poincaŕe duality of α_i. For the sake of simplicity we can assume that each $C(\alpha_i)$ is a closed smooth manifold. Take a compact set K_0 in M such that

$$\bar{\alpha_1}(C(\alpha_1))\subset K_0. \tag{4.1}$$

Note that each map ${\rm EV}_{g,m}\circ\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to M^m$ is partially smooth. For the virtual moduli chain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ in (3.83), we can jiggle $\prod_{i=1}^m\bar\alpha_i:\prod_{i=1}^m C(\alpha_i)\to M^m$ to make it intersect each ${\rm EV}_{g,m}\circ\hat\pi_I$ transversally. In this case we also say it to be transversal to

$${\rm EV}_{g,m}\circ\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0):=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{{\rm EV}_{g,m}\circ\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to M^m\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Define $C(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J)^{\mathbf{t}}_I$ to be the fiber product

$$\{(x,u)\in\prod_{i=1}^m C(\alpha_i)\times\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\mid\prod_{i=1}^m\bar\alpha_i(x)={\rm EV}_{g,m}\circ\hat\pi_I(u)\} \tag{4.3}$$

It is either empty or a stratified Banach manifold of dimension $r = 2c_1(M)(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + 2m - \sum_{i=1}^m \deg\alpha_i$ in the case $r \ge 0$. *The key is that (3.16)-(3.18) and the choices of* $\mathbf{f}^{(i)}$ *imply:*

$$C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}} \neq \emptyset \Longrightarrow i \le n_1 \text{ for any } i \in I. \tag{4.4}$$

Denote by

$$\Pi_{g,m}^I : C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_I^{\mathbf{t}} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\ (x,u) \mapsto \Pi_{g,m} \circ \hat\pi_I(u).$$

For any $L \subset I \in \mathcal{N}$, the map (3.80) naturally induces a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_L|$-fold partially smooth covering,

$$P_L^I : (P_L^I)^{-1}\big(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}}\big) \to \mathrm{Im}(P_J^I) \subset C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_L^{\mathbf{t}}$$

This is, the family $C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)^{\mathbf{t}} = \big\{C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}} \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$ is compatible.

Proposition 4.1. *The set* $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \Pi_{g,m}^I(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}})$ *is compact in* $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$. *As in Proposition 3.16, for any* $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon^{res}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ *the formal summation*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A) \\ &= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \{\Pi_{g,m}^I : C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_I^{\mathbf{t}} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

is a rational cycle *in* $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ *of dimension* $r = 2c_1(M)(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + 2m - \sum_{i=1}^m \deg\alpha_i$ *if* $r \ge 0$. *Moreover, the cobordant virtual moduli chains in (3.83) yield the cobordant virtual moduli cycles in (4.5). As in proof of Proposition 3.16 we can use (4.4) to prove that* $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_I^{\mathbf{t}}$ *is a finite set for* $r = 0$.

Proof. We only need to prove that $\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \Pi_{g,m}^I(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}})$ is compact. Since both $\prod_{i=1}^m C(\alpha_i)$ and $Cl\big(\hat\pi_I(\mathcal{M}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))\big)$ are compact, $Cl\big(\Pi_{g,m}^I(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}})\big)$ is also compact. Let $\Pi_{g,m}^I(x_k, u_k)$ be a sequence converging to $w \in Cl\big(\Pi_{g,m}^I(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}})\big)$. Here $(x_k, u_k) \in C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}}$ for $k = 1, 2\cdots$. Passing to subsequences we may assume that $x_k \to x$ and $\hat\pi_I(u_k) \to [\mathbf{f}] \in Cl\big(\hat\pi_I(\mathcal{M}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))\big)$. By (4.4), $i \le n_1$ for any $i \in I$. It follows from (3.19) that $Im(f) \subset K_2 \subset K_3$. By Proposition 3.17(ii), $[\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}^{\mathbf{t}}(M, J, A; K_3) \subset \cup_{L\in\mathcal{N}} \hat\pi_L(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_L^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0))$. So there exists a u in some $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_J^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ such that $[\mathbf{f}] = \hat\pi_J(u)$. By (4.3),

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \bar\alpha_i(x_k) = \mathrm{EV}_{g,m}(\hat\pi_I(u_k)),\ k = 1, 2, \cdots.$$

Setting $k \to \infty$ we get

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \bar\alpha_i(x) = \mathrm{EV}_{g,m}([\mathbf{f}]) = \mathrm{EV}_{g,m}(\hat\pi_L(u)).$$

So $(x,u) \in C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_L^{\mathbf{t}}$ and $\Pi_{g,m}^L(x,u) = \Pi_{g,m}(\hat\pi_L(u)) = \Pi_{g,m}([\mathbf{f}])$. Moreover,

$$w = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Pi_{g,m}^I(x_k, u_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \Pi_{g,m}(\hat\pi_I(u_k)) = \Pi_{g,m}([\mathbf{f}]).$$

Hence $w = \Pi_{g,m}^L(x,u) \in \Pi_{g,m}^L(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_L^{\mathbf{t}})$. This implies that

$$Cl\big(\Pi_{g,m}^I(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}})\big) \subset \cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \Pi_{g,m}^I(C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J)_I^{\mathbf{t}})$$

and thus that

$$\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\Pi^I_{g,m}(C(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J)^{\mathbf{t}}_I)=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}Cl\big(\Pi^I_{g,m}(C(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J)^{\mathbf{t}}_I)\big)$$

is compact. □

Clearly, two different $\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}'\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ give cobordant rational cycles $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}'}_g(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)$. Moreover, the choices of cycle representatives $\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m$ satisfying (4.1) also yield cobordant rational cycles $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)$. So they determine a unique homology class in $H_r(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\mathbb{Q})$, denoted by $[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]$ or

$$[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)] \tag{4.6}$$

because it is independent of choices of $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ and of ones of cycle representatives $\bar{\alpha}$ of $PD(\alpha)$ satisfying (4.1). One can easily prove that shrinking $\mathcal{W}^*$ and thus $\varepsilon>0$ gives the same class as in (4.6). More generally, it only depends on cobordant class of virtual moduli chains in (3.83). Furthermore we can prove that this class does not depend on all related choices. Namely,

- it is independent of choices of section s_i;
- it is independent of choices of W_i;
- it is independent of choices of K_0;
- it is independent of choices of almost complex structures $J\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$;
- it is independent of the weak deformation of the geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ).

We first admit them and put off their proofs to §4.2 – §4.6. Let $2g+m\ge 3$. If $r\ge 0$ we call the Poincaré dual of the homology class in (4.6),

$$I^{(M,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\alpha_1\otimes\cdots\otimes\alpha_m):=PD([\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)])$$

the *Gromov-Witten class* in terms of [KM]. It is clear that we can understand and write $[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]$ as $[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\otimes_{i=1}^m\alpha_i;\omega,\mu,J,A)]$ or

$$\begin{aligned}&[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m_2},\cdots,\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_{k-1}+1}^{m_k};\omega,\mu,J,A)]\quad\text{or}\\&[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\otimes_{i=1}^{m_1}\alpha_i,\otimes_{i=m_1+1}^{m_2}\alpha_i,\cdots,\otimes_{i=m_{k-1}+1}^{m_k}\alpha_i;\omega,\mu,J,A)]\end{aligned}$$

for $1\le m_1<m_2\cdots<m_k=m$.

Let $2g+m\ge 3$. If (1.5) is satisfied we define the Gromov-Witten invariants

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m):=\langle PD(\kappa),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]\rangle, \tag{4.7}$$

and define $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=0$ if (1.5) is not satisfied. Here $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the usual pair between homology and cohomology.

Note that the space $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}$ reduces to a single point for $m<3$ and that it is a smooth oriented compact manifold of dimension $2m-6$ for $m\ge 3$ ([HS2]). Then for $m\ge 3$ it is easy to see that the Gromov-Witten invariants $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)$ is equal to the intersection number of $(\Pi_{0,m}\times \mathrm{EV}_{0,m})\circ\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ with the class $\kappa\times\prod_{i=1}^m PD(\alpha_i)$ in $H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}\times M^m,\mathbb{Q})$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &=(\Pi_{0,m}\times \mathrm{EV}_{0,m})\circ\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)\cdot_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}\times M^m}(\kappa\times\prod_{i=1}^m PD(\alpha_i)).\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

These suggest an equivalent definition of the invariants in (4.7) by the integration theory at the end of the subsection.

Let the rational number in (1.6) be chosen as one given by (4.7) then these give the claims (i)-(iii) in Theorem 1.1 immediately. As to (iv), its proof is as follows:

By (1.4) we can choose a continuous path $(\psi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathrm{Symp}_0(M,\omega)$ with respect to the C^∞-strong topology to connect $id_M=\psi_0$ to $\psi_1=\psi$. Then $(\psi_t^*J)_{t\in[0,1]}$ and $(\psi_t^*\mu)_{t\in[0,1]}$ are respectively continuous paths in $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ and $\mathcal{R}(M)$ with respect to the C^∞-strong topology. It easily follows that each $(M,\omega,\psi_t^*J,\psi_t^*\mu)$ is geometrically bounded and that $(M,\omega,\psi_t^*J,\psi_t^*\mu)_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a strong deformation of the geometrically bounded symplectic manifold $(M,\omega,J_0,\mu_0)=(M,\omega,J,\mu)$. Therefore Theorem 1.1(iii) leads to Theorem 1.1(iv).

Since M is a connected, oriented and noncompact manifold of dimension $2n$ one always has

$$H^0_c(M,\mathbb{R})=0=H^{2n}(M,\mathbb{R})\quad\text{and}\quad H^0(M,\mathbb{R})\cong\mathbb{R}\cong H^{2n}_c(M,\mathbb{R}).\tag{4.9}$$

Later without special statements we always denote by $\mathbf{1}\in H^0(M,\mathbb{Q})$ the fundamental class. From the definition we easily obtain the following simple properties.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\alpha_1\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ and $\alpha_2,\cdots,\alpha_m\in H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$. Then*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}];\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1},\mathbf{1})=0\text{ if }m\ge 4\text{ or }A\ne 0\,\text{and}\,m\ge 1.$$

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}];\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\begin{cases}\int_M\alpha_1^*\wedge\alpha_2^*\wedge\alpha_3^* & \text{for } m=3, A=0\\ 0 & \text{for } m>3, A=0\end{cases}$$

Here α_i^* are closed form representatives of α_i and α_1 has a compact set.

Proof. The first result is a direct consequence of the reduction formulas. We put it here so as to compare it with the second conclusion. Theorem 5.9 gives rise to

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}];\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1},\mathbf{1})\\ &=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m-1}((\mathcal{F}_m)_*([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}]);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1})\\ &=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m-1}(0;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1})=0\end{aligned}$$

because $(\mathcal{F}_m)_*([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}])\in H_{6g-6+2m}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1};\mathbb{Q})$ must be zero.

Next we prove the second result. Assume that $m\ge 3$ and $A=0$. One easily checks that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}(M,J,0)=\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}\times M$ and that the differential $D\bar\partial_J$ at any point $[\mathbf{f}]\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}(M,J,0)$ is surjective. So for any compact submanifold $K_0\subset M$ of codimension 0 the associated virtual moduli chain with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}(M,J,0;K_3)$ (constructed by Liu-Tian's method as above) can be chosen as

$$\mathcal{C}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}\times K_3)=\{\hat\pi:\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}\times\mathrm{Int}(K_3)\to\mathcal{W}\},$$

where $\hat{\pi}(([\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}], x)) = [\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}, x]$. Note that $\mathrm{EV}_{0,m} \circ \hat{\pi}(([\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}], x)) = (x, \cdots, x) \in M^m$ and that $\Pi_{0,m} \circ \hat{\pi}(([\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}], x)) = [\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}]$. By (4.8) the GW-invariant $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{0,0,m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}]; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m)$ is exactly the intersection number of $(\Pi_{0,m} \times \mathrm{EV}_{0,m}) \circ \hat{\pi}$ and the product map

$$id \times \prod_{i=1}^{m} \bar{\alpha}_i : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m} \times C(\alpha_i) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m} \times M^m,$$

which is equal to the intersection number of the map $\prod_{i=1}^{m} \bar{\alpha}_i : C(\alpha_i) \to M^m$ with $\triangle(M^m) = \{(x, \cdots, x) \in M^m \,|\, x \in M\} \subset M^m$. Therefore

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{0,0,m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}]; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) = \int_M \wedge_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_i^*.$$

Here α_i^* are closed form representatives of α_i and α_1 has a compact support contained in K_0. By the dimension condition (1.5) we have $\sum_{i=1}^{m} \deg \alpha_i^* = 2m - 6 + 2n$. It follows from (4.8) that

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{0,0,m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,m}]; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m > 3 \\ \int_M \alpha_1^* \wedge \alpha_2^* \wedge \alpha_3^* & \text{if } m = 3. \end{cases}$$

□

For any $0 \le p \le 2n$ there exists a natural homomorphism

$$\mathbf{I}^p : H^p_c(M, \mathbb{C}) \to H^p(M, \mathbb{C}), \tag{4.10}$$

which is given by $[\eta]_c \mapsto [\eta]$ when $H^*_c(M, \mathbb{C})$ (resp. $H^*(M, \mathbb{C})$) is identified with the de-Rham cohomology with compact supports (resp. the de-Rham cohomology.) Here η is a closed p-form on M with compact support. Clearly, $\mathbf{I}^p$ maps $H^p_c(M, \mathbb{R})$ (resp. $H^p_c(M, \mathbb{Q})$) to $H^p(M, \mathbb{R})$ (resp. $H^p(M, \mathbb{Q})$). By (4.10), both $\mathbf{I}^0$ and $\mathbf{I}^{2n}$ are zero homomorphisms. It is easy to prove that $\alpha \in \mathrm{Ker}(\mathbf{I}^p)$ if and only if α has a closed form representative (and thus all closed form representatives) that is exact on M. For any $0 < p < 2n$, we denote by

$$\widehat{H}^p_c(M, \mathbb{C}) := H^p_c(M, \mathbb{C}) / \mathrm{Ker}(\mathbf{I}^p)$$

and by $\widehat{\alpha} = \alpha + \mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{I}^p)$ the equivalence class of α in the quotient space $\widehat{H}^p_c(M, \mathbb{C})$. By (4.6) it is easily seen that

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \mathbf{I}^*(\alpha_2), \cdots, \alpha_m) = \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_m) \tag{4.11}$$

if $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in H^*_c(M, \mathbb{Q})$. However, even if $\alpha_2 \in H^q_c(M, \mathbb{C})$, $0 < q < 2n$, but no one of $\{\alpha_i\}_{2 < i \le m}$ belongs to $H^*_c(M, \mathbb{C})$, we cannot define $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \mathbf{I}^p(\alpha_1), \mathbf{I}^q(\alpha_2), \cdots, \alpha_m)$ yet. Let α_1 and α_1' be two representatives of $\widehat{\alpha}_1 \in \widehat{H}^p_c(M, \mathbb{C})$. Then $\alpha_1 - \alpha_1' \in \mathrm{Ker}(\mathbf{I}^p)$. Since $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m)$ is multilinear on $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m, \kappa$ it follows from (4.11) that

Definition and Proposition 4.3. *Assume that one of the classes $\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_m$ also belongs to $H^*_c(M, \mathbb{Q})$. Then*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_m) = \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1', \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_m).$$

In particular $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le m})=0$ *if* $\alpha_1\in \mathrm{Ker}(\mathbf{I}^p)$*. Thus if* $m\ge 2$ *one may define for any representatives* α_i *of* $\widehat{\alpha}_i$*,* $i=1,\cdots,k$*,*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\{\widehat{\alpha}_i\}_{1\le i\le k},,\{\alpha_i\}_{k+1\le i\le m}):=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le m}).$$

Consequently, our Gromov-Witten invariants may descend to $\widehat{H}^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})^{\otimes m}$ *as long as* $m\ge 2$*.*

An equivalent definition. It is well-known that the intersection theory is closely related to integration. The latter is more convenient in computation (see §5.3). In the original version of this paper we use integration theory to define our invariants. By de Rham's theorem for manifolds (cf. Th3.1 and the last remark (b) in Appendix of [Ma]), for every class $\alpha\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})\cup H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$, we may always choose a closed representative form α^* on M such that its integral over every smooth integral cycle is an rational number. Similarly, since the orbifold is an rational (co)homology manifold, using Satake's de Rham's theorem for orbifolds (cf. [Sat]) we may also take for a given $\kappa\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\mathbb{Q})$ a closed representative form κ^* on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ Póincare dual to κ such that the integral of κ^* over every smooth integral cycle is a rational number. Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le m}\subset H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})\cup H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$, and at least one of them, saying α_1, belong to $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$. Then we can choose their closed representative forms α^*_i, $i=1,\cdots,m$ and a compact set K_0 in M such that

$$\mathrm{supp}(\wedge_{i=1}^m\alpha_i^*)\subset K_0. \tag{4.12}$$

By the construction of $C(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I$ in (4.3) it is not hard to check that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{C_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I}(\Pi^I_{g,m})^*\kappa^* \\ &=\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)}\big((\Pi_{g,m}\times \mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat{\pi}_I\big)^*(\kappa^*\times\prod_{i=1}^m\alpha_i^*)\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

for each $I\in\mathcal{N}$. Here because of (1.5) both integrations are taken on the top strata of two stratified manifolds in an obvious sense and exist since $C_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ have compact closures. By (4.7)

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &=\langle PD(\kappa),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]\rangle\\ &=\int_{\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)}\kappa^*\\ &\text{“}=\text{”}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{C(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I}(\Pi^I_{g,m})^*\kappa^*.\end{aligned}$$

This and (4.13) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &\text{“}=\text{”}\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)}\big((\Pi_{g,m}\times \mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat{\pi}_I\big)^*(\kappa^*\times\prod_{i=1}^m\alpha_i^*).\end{aligned}\tag{4.14}$$

As explained for the formal summation in (4.5) we here write "$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$" to means that we only count these overlap parts once in the summation of right side of (4.14). Precisely, for $I,J\in\mathcal{N}$ with $J\hookrightarrow I$ it is claimed in Corollary 3.15 that

$$\hat\pi^I_J:(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(K_0))\subset\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)\subset\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(K_0)$$

is a $|\Gamma_I|/|\Gamma_J|$-fold stratawise smooth covering. So

$$\begin{aligned}&\textstyle\int_{(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(K_0))}((\Pi_{g,m}\times\mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat\pi_I)^*(\kappa^*\times\prod^m_{i=1}\alpha^*_i)\\ =&\textstyle\frac{|\Gamma_I|}{|\Gamma_J|}\int_{\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)}((\Pi_{g,m}\times\mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat\pi_J)^*(\kappa^*\times\prod^m_{i=1}\alpha^*_i).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that the part

$$\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{(\hat\pi^I_J)^{-1}(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(K_0))}((\Pi_{g,m}\times\mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat\pi_I)^*\Big(\kappa^*\times\prod^m_{i=1}\alpha^*_i\Big)$$

in $\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)}((\Pi_{g,m}\times\mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat\pi_I)^*(\kappa^*\times\prod^m_{i=1}\alpha^*_i)$ is equal to one

$$\frac{1}{|\Gamma_J|}\int_{\mathrm{Im}(\hat\pi^I_J)}((\Pi_{g,m}\times\mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat\pi_I)^*\Big(\kappa^*\times\prod^m_{i=1}\alpha^*_i\Big)$$

in $\frac{1}{|\Gamma_J|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_J(K_0)}((\Pi_{g,m}\times\mathrm{EV}_{g,m})\circ\hat\pi_I)^*(\kappa^*\times\prod^m_{i=1}\alpha^*_i)$. For more details the readers may refer to our expository paper [LuT]. For simplicity we later shall omit the double quotation marks in "$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$" without occurring of confusions. Hence we may use (4.14) to define the same invariants as (4.7).

4.2 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of sections s_i.

We only need to prove the conclusion in the case increasing a section. Assume that a global smooth section $\hat s=\{\hat s_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$ of the bundle system $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*,\widehat V^*)=\{(\widehat E^*_I,\widehat V^*_I)\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ as $\hat s_{ij}=\{(\hat s_{ij})_I\}_{I\in\mathcal{N}}$ in (3.76) is such that the global section $\Psi'=\{\Psi'_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}\}$ of the bundle system

$$\big(\mathbf{P}^*_1\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*,\widehat V^*\times\mathbf{B}_{\eta'}(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})\big)=\big\{\big(\mathbf{P}^*_1\widehat E^*_I,\widehat V^*_I\times\mathbf{B}_{\eta'}(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})\big)\;\big|\;I\in\mathcal{N}\big\}$$

is transversal to the zero section. Here $\mathbf{P}_1$ is as in (3.75) and

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi'_I:\widehat V^*_I\times\mathbf{B}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})\to\mathbf{P}^*_1\widehat E^*_I,\\ &(\hat x_I;\mathbf{t},t)\mapsto(\bar\partial_J)_I(\hat x_I)+\sum^{n_3}_{i=1}\sum^{q_i}_{j=1}t_{ij}(\hat s_{ij})_I(\hat x_I)+t\hat s_I(\hat x_I).\end{aligned}$$

As in Corollary 3.15 and (3.75) we get a family of cobordant singular chains in $\mathcal{W}^*$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},t)}(K_0)':=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{(\mathbf{t},t)}_I(K_0)'\to\mathcal{W}^*\}\quad\forall(\mathbf{t},t)\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{q+1}),$$

where $0 < \varepsilon' < \eta'$ and $\mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})$ is a residual subset of $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon_1}(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})$. For $0 < \tau \le \min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}$ let us consider the bundle system

$$\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*, \widehat{V}^* \times \mathbf{B}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{q+1}) \times [0,1]\big) = \big\{\big(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{E}_I^*, \widehat{V}_I^* \times \mathbf{B}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{q+1}) \times [0,1]\big)\,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\big\}$$

and its smooth section $\Phi = \{\Phi_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}\}$,

$$\Phi_I\,:\, (\hat{x}_I; \mathbf{t}, t; r) \mapsto (\bar{\partial}_J)_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_3}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij}(\hat{s}_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I) + rt\hat{s}_I(\hat{x}_I)$$

for any $(\hat{x}_I; \mathbf{t}, t; r) \in \widehat{V}_I^* \times \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{q+1}) \times [0,1]$, where $\mathbf{P}_1$ is still the projection to the first factor of $\widehat{V}_I^* \times \mathbf{B}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{q+1}) \times [0,1]$. If $\tau > 0$ is small enough, Φ is transversal to the zero section. It follows that for each $(\mathbf{t}, t)$ in some residual subset $\mathbf{B}^{res}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})$ of $\mathbf{B}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})$ and each $I \in \mathcal{N}$ the section

$$\Phi_I^{(\mathbf{t},t)}\,:\, (\hat{x}_I; r) \mapsto \Phi_I(\hat{x}, \mathbf{t}, t; r)$$

of the bundle $(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{E}_I^*, \widehat{V}_I^* \times [0,1])$ is transversal to the zero section. Any $(\mathbf{t}, t) \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_\tau(\mathbb{R}^{q+1}) \cap \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{q+1})$ yields a virtual module chain in $\mathcal{W} \times [0,1]$

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},t)} := \textstyle\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}''_I : (\Phi_I^{(\mathbf{t},t)})^{-1}(0) \to \mathcal{W}\}$$

with $\partial\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},t)} = (\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0) \times \{0\}) \cup (-\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},t)}(K_0)' \times \{1\})$. ($\partial\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},t)}$ is the part of $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},t)}$ of codimension one.) Here $\mathbf{t}$ can be required to belong to $\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ because of the Claim A.1.11 in [LeO].

Lemma 4.4([LeO]). *Let X and Y be metric spaces which satisfy the second axiom of countability. Suppose that S is a countable intersection of open dense subsets in the product space $X \times Y$. Consider the space X_S consisting of those $x \in X$ such that $S \cap \{x\} \times Y$ is a countable intersection of open dense subsets in $\{x\} \times Y$. Then X_S is a countable intersection of open dense subsets in X.*

So $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},t)}(K_0)'$ are virtual module chain cobordant. It implies that the corresponding $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m} \circ \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ and $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m} \circ \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t},t)}(K_0)'$, and thus the rational cycles $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)$ and $\mathcal{C}_g^{(\mathbf{t},t)}(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)'$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ (as given by (4.5)) are cobordant. The desired conclusion follows.

4.3 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of W_i.

Firstly, we prove the case that *a W_{n_3+1} and the corresponding sections $\tilde{s}_{(n_3+1)j} = \beta_{(n_3+1)j} \cdot \tilde{\nu}_{(n_3+1)j}$, $j = 1, \cdots, q_{n_3+1}$, are added.* In the case let us denote by

$$\mathcal{W}_0 = \cup_{i=1}^{n_3} W_i,\ \mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}^M_{A,g,m}|_{\mathcal{W}_0},\ \mathcal{W}_1 = \cup_{i=1}^{n_3+1} W_i,\ \mathcal{E}_1 = \mathcal{E}^M_{A,g,m}|_{\mathcal{W}_1}.$$

Then $\mathcal{W}_0$ is an open stratified suborbifold of $\mathcal{W}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}_1|_{\mathcal{W}_0}$. Consider the stratified orbifold $\mathcal{W}_1 \times [0,1]$ with boundary $\partial(\mathcal{W}_1 \times [0,1]) = (\mathcal{W}_1 \times \{0\}) \cup (\mathcal{W}_1 \times \{1\})$, and the pull-back stratified orbifold bundle $\mathrm{pr}^*\mathcal{E}_1 \to \mathcal{W}_1 \times [0,1]$ via the projection $\mathrm{pr} : \mathcal{W}_1 \times [0,1] \to \mathcal{W}_1$. Let us construct a family of uniformizers of an open covering of it. For $i = 1, \cdots, n_3$ and $j = 1, \cdots, n_3 + 1$ set

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\widetilde{W}'_i = \widetilde{W}_i \times [0, \frac{3}{4}), & W'_i = W_i \times [0, \frac{3}{4}), & \pi'_i = \pi_i \times \mathbf{1}, \\
\widetilde{W}'_{n_3+j} = \widetilde{W}_j \times (\frac{1}{4}, 1], & W'_{n_3+j} = W_j \times (\frac{1}{4}, 1], & \pi'_{n_3+j} = \pi_j \times \mathbf{1}, \\
\Gamma'_i = \{g \times \mathbf{1} \,|\, g \in \Gamma_i\}, & \Gamma'_{n_3+j} = \{g \times \mathbf{1} \,|\, g \in \Gamma_j\}, & \\
\widetilde{E}'_i = p_i^* \widetilde{E}_i, & E'_i = (\mathrm{pr}^* \mathcal{E})|_{W'_i}, & p_i : \widetilde{W}_i \times [0, \frac{3}{4}) \to \widetilde{W}_i, \\
\widetilde{E}'_{n_3+j} = p^*_{n_3+j} \widetilde{E}_j, & E'_{n_3+j} = (\mathrm{pr}^* \mathcal{E})|_{W'_{n_3+j}}, & p_{n_3+j} : \widetilde{W}_j \times (\frac{1}{4}, 1] \to \widetilde{W}_j.
\end{array}$$

Here all p_i, p_{n_3+j} are the projections to the first factors. Setting

$$\underline{\mathcal{W}} = \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_3} W_i \times [0, \frac{3}{4}) \Big) \cup \Big(\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_3+1} W_i \times (\frac{1}{4}, 1] \Big) \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\mathcal{E}} = (\mathrm{pr}^* \mathcal{E}_1)|_{\underline{\mathcal{W}}}.$$

Then $\underline{\mathcal{W}}$ is an open stratified suborbifold of $\mathcal{W}_1 \times [0, 1]$, and has also the boundary $\partial \underline{\mathcal{W}} = (\mathcal{W}_0 \times \{0\}) \cup (\mathcal{W}_1 \times \{1\})$, and $\underline{\mathcal{E}} \to \underline{\mathcal{W}}$ is a stratified orbifold bundle.

Take Γ'_k-invariant, continuous and stratawise smooth cut-off functions β'_k on $\widetilde{W}'_k$, $k = 1, \cdots, 2n_3 + 1$ such that:

- $\beta'_k(x, 0) = \beta_k(x)$, $\forall (x, 0) \in \widetilde{W}'_k$ and $k = 1, \cdots, n_3$,
- $\beta'_k(x, 1) = \beta_{k-n_3}(x)$, $\forall (x, 1) \in \widetilde{W}'_k$ and $k = n_3 + 1, \cdots, 2n_3 + 1$,
- $\widetilde{U}'^0_k := \{e \in \widetilde{W}'_k \mid \beta'_k(e) > 0\} \subset\subset \widetilde{W}'_k$, $k = 1, \cdots, 2n_3 + 1$,
- $\cup_{k=1}^{2n_3+1} V'^0_k \supset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A, K_3) \times [0, 1]$, where $V'^0_k = \pi'_I(\widetilde{V}'^0_k)$ and $\widetilde{V}'^0_k := \{e \in \widetilde{W}'_k \mid \beta'_k(e) = 1\}$, $k = 1, \cdots, 2n_3 + 1$.

Then we have:

$$\begin{array}{l}
U'^0_k \cap (W_k \times \{0\}) = U^0_k \times \{0\}, \quad k = 1, \cdots, n_3, \\
U'^0_{n_3+k} \cap (W_k \times \{1\}) = U^0_k \times \{1\}, \ k = 1, \cdots, n_3 + 1, \\
V'^0_k \cap (W_k \times \{0\}) = V^0_k \times \{0\}, \quad k = 1, \cdots, n_3, \\
V'^0_{n_3+k} \cap (W_k \times \{1\}) = V^0_k \times \{1\}, \ k = 1, \cdots, n_3 + 1.
\end{array}$$

Let $\tilde{s}_{ij} = \beta_i \cdot \tilde{\nu}_{ij}$ be the sections of the bundle $\widetilde{E}_i \to \widetilde{W}_i$ satisfying (3.21), $i = 1, \cdots, n_3 + 1$ and $j = 1, \cdots, q_i$. For $k = 1, \cdots, n_3$ we choose the sections of the bundle $\widetilde{E}'_k \to \widetilde{W}'_k$,

$$\tilde{s}'_{kj}(x, t) = \beta'_k(x, t) \cdot \tilde{\nu}_{kj}(x) \quad \forall \, (x, t) \in \widetilde{W}'_k, \ j = 1, \cdots, q_k,$$

and for $k = 1, \cdots, n_3 + 1$, ones of the bundle $\widetilde{E}'_{n_3+k} \to \widetilde{W}'_{n_3+k}$,

$$\tilde{s}'_{(n_3+k)j}(x, t) = \beta'_{n_3+k}(x, t) \cdot \tilde{\nu}_{kj}(x) \quad \forall (x, t) \in \widetilde{W}'_{n_3+k}, \ j = 1, \cdots, q_k.$$

These $q + q'$ sections satisfy the corresponding properties with (3.12). In this subsection $q = \sum_{i=1}^{n_3} q_i$ and $q' = \sum_{i=1}^{n_3+1} q_i$. Let $\mathcal{N}'$ be the set of all subsets $I \subset \{1, \cdots, 2n_3 + 1\}$ with $W'_I = \cap_{i \in I} W'_i \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\{W'_i \,|\, 1 \le i \le 2n_3 + 1\}$ still satisfies the corresponding condition with the second one in (3.20). For the original pairs of Γ_i-invariant open sets $W^j_i \subset\subset U^j_i$ with

$$U^1_i \subset\subset W^2_i \subset\subset \cdots \subset\subset W^{n_3}_i \subset\subset U^{n_3}_i \subset\subset W^{n_3+1}_i = W_i,$$

$j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_3$ and $i = 1, \cdots, n_3 + 1$ we take pairs of Γ'_k-invariant open sets $W'^l_k \subset\subset U'^l_k$, $k = 1, \cdots, 2n_3 + 1$ and $l = 1, \cdots, 2n_3$ such that the following hold:

$$U'^1_k \subset\subset W'^2_k \subset\subset \cdots \subset\subset W'^{2n_3}_k \subset\subset U'^{2n_3}_k \subset\subset W'^{2n_3+1}_k = W_k;$$

$$\begin{gathered} W'^l_k \cap (W_k \times \{0\}) = W^l_k \quad \text{and} \quad U'^l_k \cap (W_k \times \{0\}) = U^l_k, \\ k = 1, \cdots, n_3 \quad \text{and} \quad l = 1, \cdots, n_3 - 1; \end{gathered}$$

$$\begin{gathered} W'^{n_3+l}_{n_3+k} \cap (W_k \times \{1\}) = W^l_k \quad \text{and} \quad U'^{n_3+l}_{n_2+k} \cap (W_k \times \{1\}) = U^l_k, \\ k = 1, \cdots, n_3 + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad l = 1, \cdots, n_3. \end{gathered}$$

Then as in (3.62), for each $I \in \mathcal{N}'$ with $|I| = k$ we define

$$V'_I = (\cap_{i \in I} W'^k_i) \setminus Cl(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\cap_{j \in J} Cl(U'^k_j))).$$

Let $\mathcal{N}'' = \{I \subset \{1, \cdots, n_3 + 1\} \,|\, W_I = \cap_{i \in I} W_i \neq \emptyset\}$. It is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{N}'' = \{I - n_3 \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}',\ \max(I) > n_3\}.$$

For each $I \in \mathcal{N}^{''}$ with $|I| = k$ we also define

$$V''_I = (\cap_{i \in I} W^k_i) \setminus \bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\cap_{j \in J} Cl(U^k_j)).$$

Let $\max I$ (resp. $\min I$) be the largest (resp. smallest) number, $I - n_3 = \{i - n_3 \,|\, i \in I\}$ if $\min I > n_3$. The keys are

$$V'_I \cap \big(\cup_{k=1}^{n_3} W_k \times \{0\} \big) = \begin{cases} V_I \times \{0\}, & \max I \le n_3, \\ \emptyset, & \max I > n_3, \end{cases} \tag{4.15}$$

$$V'_I \cap \big(\cup_{k=1}^{n_3+1} W_k \times \{1\} \big) = \begin{cases} V''_{I-n_3} \times \{1\}, & \min I > n_3, \\ \emptyset, & \min I \le n_3. \end{cases} \tag{4.16}$$

As in (3.73) we also have the corresponding V'^*_I, which satisfies the similar properties to (4.15) and (4.16). Repeating the previous arguments we get a (compatible) system of bundles

$$\big(\mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{\mathcal{E}}'^*, \widehat{V}'^* \times \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^{q'})\big) = \big\{ \big(\mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{E}'^*_I, \widehat{V}'^*_I \times \mathbf{B}_\eta(\mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^{q'})\big) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}' \big\}$$

and a global PS section $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathcal{S}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}'\}$ of it given by

$$\mathcal{S}_I :\, (\hat{x}_I; \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \mapsto (\bar{\partial}_J)_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_3} \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij} (\hat{s}'_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_3+1} \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t'_{ij} (\hat{s}'_{(i+n_3)j})_I(\hat{x}_I)$$

for any $(\hat{x}_I; \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}') \in \widehat{V}'^*_I \times \mathbf{B}_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^{q'})$, where $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\mathbf{t}' = \{t'_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{q'}$.

For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, as in Theorem 3.14 we can use it to construct a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains with boundary and of dimension $2m + 2c_1(A) + 2(3 - n)(g - 1) + 1$ in $\underline{\mathcal{W}}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')}(K_0) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}'} \frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|} \{ \hat{\pi}'_I : (\mathcal{S}_I^{(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}')})^{-1}(0) \to \underline{\mathcal{W}} \}$$

for $(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')\in \mathbf{B}^{res}_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^q\times\mathbb{R}^{q'})$. Here $\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_I(\hat x_I)=\mathcal{S}_I(\hat x_I;\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')$. Note that the stratified smooth manifold $(\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_I)^{-1}(0)$ has no boundary if and only if $I\in\mathcal{N}'$ contains at least two numbers, one of them is no more than n_3 and other is no less than n_3. So its two boundary components, denoted by $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_0$ and $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_1$, are respectively virtual moduli chains in $\mathcal{W}_0\times\{0\}$ and $\mathcal{W}_1\times\{1\}$ given by

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_0=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}',\,\max(I)\le n_3}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:(\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_I)^{-1}(0)\cap(\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(\mathcal{W}_0\times\{0\})\to\mathcal{W}_0\times\{0\}\},$$

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_1=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}',\,\min(I)>n_3}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I:(\mathcal{S}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_I)^{-1}(0)\cap(\hat\pi'_I)^{-1}(\mathcal{W}_1\times\{1\})\to\mathcal{W}_1\times\{1\}\}.$$

Consider the evaluation $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}_{g,m}:\underline{\mathcal{W}}\to M^m,\ (x,t)\mapsto \mathrm{EV}_{g,m}(x)$, and denote by $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}^0_{g,m}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}^1_{g,m}$ the restrictions of it to $\mathcal{W}_0\times\{0\}$ and $\mathcal{W}_1\times\{1\}$ respectively. Using $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}^0_{g,m}\circ\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_0$ and $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}^1_{g,m}\circ\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_1$, and as in Proposition 4.1 we can derive two rational cycles

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_0\quad\text{and}\quad \mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_1$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ of dimension $2c_1(M)(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)+2m-\sum_{i=1}^m\deg\alpha_i$, respectively. Note that $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}_{g,m}\circ\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)$ has exactly two boundary components, $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}^0_{g,m}\circ\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_0$ and $\overline{\mathrm{EV}}^1_{g,m}\circ\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_1$. As usual we can use it to construct a rational chain $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ of dimension $2c_1(M)(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)+2m+1-\sum_{i=1}^m\deg\alpha_i$ with exact two boundary components $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_0$ and $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_1$. So we get

$$[\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_0]+[\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_1]=0.\tag{4.17}$$

For $(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\epsilon(\mathbb{R}^q\times\mathbb{R}^{q'})$, by Lemma 4.4 we can require $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ and $\mathbf{t}'\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$. Note that $\{I\in\mathcal{N}'\,|\,\max(I)\le n_3\}=\mathcal{N}$ and that (4.15) implies that $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0)_0$ is actually independent of $\mathbf{t}'$. Therefore $\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_0$ is exactly identified with the virtual module cycle $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)$ in (4.5). So

$$[\mathcal{C}^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_0]=[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)].\tag{4.18}$$

Using the bundles $\widetilde{E}_i\to\widetilde{W}_i$ and their sections $\tilde s_{ij}=\beta_i\cdot\tilde\nu_{ij},\ i=1,\cdots,n_3+1,\ j=1,\cdots,q_i$, we can construct as before a bundle system

$$(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{\mathcal{E}}''^*,\widehat{V}''^*\times\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon''}(\mathbb{R}^{q'}))=\big\{(\mathbf{P}_1^*\widehat{E}''^*_I,\widehat{V}''^*_I\times\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon''}(\mathbb{R}^{q'}))\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}''\big\}$$

and its global smooth section $\Psi=\{\Psi_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}''\}$ given by

$$\Psi_I:\,(\hat x_I,\mathbf{t})\mapsto(\bar\partial_J)_I(\hat x_I)+\sum_{i=1}^{n_3+1}\sum_{j=1}^{q_i}t_{ij}\cdot(\hat s''_{ij})_I(\hat x_I)$$

for any $(\hat x_I,\mathbf{t})\in\widehat{V}''^*_I\times\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon''}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$. Here

$$V''^*_I=V''_I\cap\mathcal{W}^*,\quad \widehat{V}''^*_I=(\hat\pi''_I)^{-1}(V''^*_I),\quad \widehat{E}''^*_I=\widehat{E}''^{\Gamma_I}_I|_{\widehat{V}''^*_I}.$$

Denote by

$$\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)'',\ \mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon''}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$$

the corresponding cobordant rational cycles in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ constructed from them. As above we can take $\mathbf{t}=\mathbf{t}'$ and identify $-\mathcal{C}_g^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_1$ with $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}'}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)''$. Hence

$$-[\mathcal{C}_g^{(\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}')}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_1]=[\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}'}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)''].\tag{4.19}$$

It follows from (4.17), (4.18) and (4.19) that

$$[\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]=[\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}'}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)''].$$

The desired conclusion is proved.

The general case easily follows from §4.2 and the above arguments.

Remark 4.5. If (M,ω) is a closed symplectic manifold we may take $K_0=M$ and W_i, $i=1,\cdots,n_0$ to construct a virtual moduli cycle $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}$ as in Proposition 3.16. It gives a homology class $[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}]\in H_r(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m};\mathbb{Q})$. Here $r=2m+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)$. The arguments in last two subsections show that it is independent of the choices of neighborhoods and sections. Suitably modifying the arguments in this subsection one can easily prove that it is also independent of the choice of almost complex structures $J\in\mathcal{J}(M,\omega)$ and in fact only depend on the symplectic deformation class of the symplectic form ω. Using $\Pi_{g,m}$ and $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m}$ we get a homology class

$$[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,\langle\omega\rangle,A)]=(\Pi_{g,m}\times\mathrm{EV}_{g,m})_*([\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}])\in H_r(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\times M^m;\mathbb{Q}),$$

called the *virtual fundamental class*, where $\langle\omega\rangle$ denotes the deformation class of the symplectic form ω. It can be used to define the Gromov-Witten invariants for closed symplectic manifolds

$$\mathcal{GW}^{M,\langle\omega\rangle}_{A,g,m}:H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m};\mathbb{Q})\times H^*(M;\mathbb{Q})^{\otimes m}\to\mathbb{Q}$$

by $\mathcal{GW}^{M,\langle\omega\rangle}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\langle[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,\langle\omega\rangle,A)],PD(\kappa)\oplus\wedge_{i=1}^m\alpha_i\rangle$. This case had been completed by different authors(cf. [FuO, LiT2, R, Sie]) though we do not know whether or not our result is same as one of them.

4.4 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of K_0.

We shall prove it in two steps.

Step 1. Take a positive integer $r>3$. We furthermore choose

$$\mathbf{f}^{(i)}\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_r)\setminus\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3),\ i=n_3+1,\cdots,n_r$$

such that the corresponding $V^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}$ and $W_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}$, and the original ones satisfy

$$\cup_{i=1}^{n_r}V^0_{\mathbf{f}^{(i)}}\supset\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_r).$$

Note that (3.16)-(3.19) imply

$$W_i\cap W_j=\emptyset,\ \forall i\le n_1,\ j>n_3.\tag{4.20}$$

We still use the abbreviation notations below (3.20). For $i = n_3+1, \cdots, n_r$, we furthermore take the sections $\tilde{s}_{ij}$ of the bundle $\widetilde{E}_i \to \widetilde{W}_i$, $j = 1, \cdots, q_i$ satisfying (3.21). We replace $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ with

$$\mathcal{W}' = \cup_{i=1}^{n_r} W_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}' = \cup_{i=1}^{n_r} \mathcal{E}_i$$

and denote by $\mathcal{N}_r = \{I \subset \{1, \cdots, n_r\} \,|\, W_I = \cap_{i\in I} W_i \neq \emptyset\}$. On the basis of the original pairs of Γ_i-invariant open sets $W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j$, $j = 1, 2, \cdots, n_3 - 1$, $i = 1, \cdots, n_3$ we add some pairs of Γ_i-invariant open sets $W_i^j \subset\subset U_i^j$ such that for $i = 1, \cdots, n_r$,

$$U_i^1 \subset\subset \cdots \subset\subset W_i^{n_3} \subset\subset U_i^{n_3} \cdots \subset\subset W_i^{n_r-1} \subset\subset U_i^{n_r-1} \subset\subset W_i^{n_r} = W_i.$$

Then as before, for each $I \in \mathcal{N}_r$ with $|I| = k$ we define

$$V'_I = (\cap_{i\in I} W_i^k) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>k} (\cap_{j\in J} Cl(U_j^k))\Big) \tag{4.21}$$

and get the corresponding $V_I'^*$. Let $q' = \sum_{i=1}^{n_r} q_i$. Repeating the previous arguments we get a (compatible) system of bundles

$$(\mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{\mathcal{E}}'^*, \widehat{V}'^* \times \mathbf{B}_{\eta_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})) = \{(\mathbf{P}_1^* \widehat{E}_I'^*, \widehat{V}_I'^* \times \mathbf{B}_{\eta_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})) \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}_r\}$$

and a global smooth section $\Psi' = \{\Psi'_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}_r\}$ of it given by

$$\Psi'_I : (\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \mapsto (\bar{\partial}_J)_I(\hat{x}_I) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_r} \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} t_{ij} \cdot (\hat{s}'_{ij})_I(\hat{x}_I) \tag{4.22}$$

for any $(\hat{x}_I, \mathbf{t}) \in \widehat{V}_I'^* \times \mathbf{B}_{\eta_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$. As in Corollary 3.14 we have a positive number $\varepsilon_r \in (0, \eta_r)$ and a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains in $\mathcal{W}'^* \supset \mathcal{W}^*$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)' := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}_r} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \{\hat{\pi}'_I : \mathcal{M}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)' \to \mathcal{W}^*\} \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'}). \tag{4.23}$$

Now we need to compare these virtual moduli cycles with ones in (3.83). To this goal recall that a subset of a topological space is often called *residual* if it is the countable intersection of open dense sets. Therefore Lemma 4.4 asserts that if S is residual then $X_S = \{x \in X \,|\, S \cap (\{x\} \times Y)$ is residual in $\{x\} \times Y\}$ is residual in X. For $r > 3$ and $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$ we define

$$\rho_r = \sup\{\rho > 0 \,|\, \mathbf{B}_\rho(\mathbb{R}^q) \times \mathbf{B}_\rho(\mathbb{R}^{q'-q}) \subset \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})\}.$$

Then $\mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^q) \times \mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'-q}) \subset \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$. Each $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$ can be written as $(\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{t}^{(2)})$, where $\mathbf{t}^{(1)} \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ and $\mathbf{t}^{(2)} \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'-q})$. Denote by $\mathbf{B}^{reg}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ be the set of $\mathbf{t}^{(1)} \in \mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^q)$ such that $\mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'}) \cap (\{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}\} \times \mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'-q}))$ is residual in $\mathbf{t}^{(1)} \times \mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'-q})$. By Lemma 4.4 it is residual in $\mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^q)$. Thus the intersection

$$\mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^q) \cap \mathbf{B}^{reg}_{\rho_3}(\mathbb{R}^q) \subset \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^q)$$

is also residual in $\mathbf{B}_{\rho_r}(\mathbb{R}^q)$. In particular it is nonempty. This shows that we can always take $\mathbf{t} = (\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{t}^{(2)}) \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$ such that $\mathbf{t}^{(1)} \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon_r}(\mathbb{R}^q)$. Here we can also assume that ε_r is less than ε in (3.83).

Let us compare the virtual moduli cycle $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)'$ with one $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}(K_0)$ obtained by (3.83). By (4.20), if $I\in\mathcal{N}$ contains some number $i\in\{n_1+1,\cdots,n_3\}$, then $W_I\subset W_i$. By (3.16)-(3.19) and choice of $\mathbf{f}^{(i)}$ it is not hard to see that each map in W_i has the image set contained outside K_0. Therefore the image of the map $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m}\circ\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to M^m$ is contained outside the subset $K_0^m\subset\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\times M^m$. It follows that the fibre product

$$C(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I=\emptyset$$

and thus that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A) &&(4.24)\\&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\Pi^I_{g,m}:C(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}\\&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_1}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\Pi^I_{g,m}:C(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathcal{N}_1=\{I\in\mathcal{N}\mid\max(I)\le n_1\}$. The same reason leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)' &&(4.25)\\&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_r}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\Pi^I_{g,m}:C(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)'^{\mathbf{t}}_I\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}\\&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_1}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\Pi^I_{g,m}:C(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)'^{\mathbf{t}}_I\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here $C(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)'^{\mathbf{t}}_I$ is the fibre product obtained in (4.3) by replacing $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$ and $\hat\pi_I$ by $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)'$ and $\hat\pi'_I$ respectively. For $I\in\mathcal{N}_1$ with $|I|=k$, (3.62), (3.63) and (4.21) imply

$$V_I=(\cap_{i\in I}W^k_i)\setminus(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{N}:|J|=k+1}(\cap_{j\in J}Cl(U^k_j))),$$

$$V'_I=(\cap_{i\in I}W^k_i)\setminus(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{N}_r:|J|=k+1}(\cap_{j\in J}Cl(U^k_j))).$$

Note that $\cap_{j\in J}Cl(U^k_j)$ and $\cap_{i\in I}W^k_i$ are disjoint if J contains a number greater than n_3. So

$$\begin{aligned}&(\cap_{i\in I}W^k_i)\setminus Cl(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{N}_r:|J|=k+1}(\cap_{j\in J}Cl(U^k_j)))\\&=(\cap_{i\in I}W^k_i)\setminus Cl(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{N}:|J|=k+1}(\cap_{j\in J}Cl(U^k_j))).\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $V_I=V'_I$, $\forall I\in\mathcal{N}_1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\widehat V^*_I=\widehat V'^*_I,\ \widehat E^*_I=\widehat E'^*_I,\ \widehat\pi_I=\widehat\pi'_I,(\hat s_{ij})_I=(\hat s'_{ij})_I,\\&\forall I\in\mathcal{N}_1,\ i=1,\cdots,n_3,j=1,\cdots,q_i.\end{aligned}$$

But $(\hat s'_{ij})_I=0$ for any $i>n_3$. It follows from (4.22) and the definition of Ψ_I in (3.76) that

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)'=\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_I(K_0)\times\{\mathbf{t}^{(2)}\},\quad\forall I\in\mathcal{N}_1.$$

From this, (4.24) and (4.25) it follows that $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)$ can be identified with $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)'$. We get the desired result

$$[\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)] = [\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)'].$$

Step 2. Let $K_0' \subset M$ be another compact subset containing $\mathrm{suppt}(\alpha_1) \supseteq \mathrm{suppt}(\wedge_{i=1}^m \alpha_i)$. Since $\cup_{r=1}^\infty K_r = M$ we can take a positive integer $r > 6$ such that

$$K_3' := \{x \in M \,|\, d(x, K_0') \le 3C\} \subset K_{r-3}.$$

Then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_3') \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_{r-3})$. Assume as above that $\mathbf{f}_i' \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_3')$, $i = 1, \cdots, l_3$, and their open neighborhoods W_i', $i = 1, \cdots, l_3$, and the sections $\tilde\sigma_{ij}$, $i = 1, \cdots, k_3$ and $j = 1, \cdots, p_i$ can used to construct a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}},\ \forall \mathbf{t}^{(1)} \in \mathbf{B}_\delta^{res}(\mathbb{R}^p).$$

Here $p = p_1 + \cdots + p_{k_3}$. Furthermore we choose points $\mathbf{f}_i' \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_r) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_3')$, $i = l_3 + 1, \cdots, l_r$, and their open neighborhoods W_i', $i = l_3 + 1, \cdots, l_r$, and the sections $\tilde\sigma_{ij}$, $i = l_3 + 1, \cdots, l_r$ and $j = 1, \cdots, p_i$ such that they and the open neighborhoods $\widetilde{W}_i'$, $i = 1, \cdots, l_3$ and the sections $\tilde\sigma_{ij}$, $i = 1, \cdots, k_3, j = 1, \cdots, p_i$ together can be used to form another family of cobordant virtual moduli chains

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{t}},\ \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}_{\delta_r}^{res}(\mathbb{R}^{p'}),$$

where $p' = p_1 + \cdots + p_{k_r}$. By Step 1 we know that using the virtual moduli chains $\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{t}}$ yields the same homology class in (4.6). On the other hand, the above construction of $\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{t}}$ shows that the virtual moduli chains $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)'$ of (4.23) and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}^{\mathbf{t}'}$ also gives the same homology class in (4.6) for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon_r}^{res}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$ and $\mathbf{t}' \in \mathbf{B}_{\delta_r}^{res}(\mathbb{R}^{p'})$. Therefore the statement of this subsection is proved.

Remark 4.6. In the arguments above we have chosen the constant C given by (3.18). That is, $C = 6 + \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}\omega(A)$. Actually the methods of this subsection may be used to prove that the left side of (4.11) is independent of choices of a fixed constant $C \ge 6 + \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}\omega(A)$. Indeed, for a given constant $\widehat{C} > 6 + \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\alpha_0^2 r_0}\omega(A)$ and the compact subsets

$$\widehat{K}_j := \{q \in M \,|\, d_\mu(q, K_0) \le j\widehat{C}\},\ j = 1, 2, \cdots,$$

we can choose a positive integer number $r > 3$ so large that $\widehat{K}_3 \subset K_r$ and thus

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; \widehat{K}_3) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_r).$$

Here K_3 is given by (3.17). Then we can use the methods of this subsection to construct two virtual moduli chains $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ from $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; \widehat{K}_3)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_r)$ such that using $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$ yields the same homology class in (4.6).

4.5 The homology class in (4.6) being independent of choices of almost complex structures $J \in \mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$.

We want to prove that

$$[\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J_0,A)] = [\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J_1,A)] \tag{4.26}$$

for any two $J_0, J_1 \in \mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$. Without loss of generality we assume that (1.1) holds for them. By Proposition 2.3 we have a smooth path $(J_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$ connecting J_0 to J_1 such that for $\gamma_0 = \alpha_0^3/\beta_0^2 (< \alpha_0)$,

$$\omega(X, J_tX) \ge \gamma_0\|X\|_\mu^2,\ \forall X \in TM \,\text{and}\, t \in [0,1].$$

We still assume that $\text{suppt}(\wedge_{i=1}^m \alpha_i)$ is contained in K_0. Take a positive constant C satisfying

$$C > 6 + \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\gamma_0^2 r_0}\omega(A).$$

Then for $K_j := \{q \in M \,|\, d_\mu(q,K_0) \le jC\},\ j = 1,2,\cdots$, we have

$$\text{Im}(\mathbf{f}) \subset K_4, \quad \forall \mathbf{f} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_t,A;K_3) \text{ and } t \in [0,1].$$

Using $\cup_{t\in[0,1]}\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_t,A;K_3)$ we can construct a virtual moduli chain cobordsim between the virtual moduli chains associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_0,A;K_3)$ and one with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_1,A;K_3)$. It may yield the cobordant rational cycles $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J_0,A)$ and $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}'}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J_1,A)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$. Equation (4.26) is proved.

4.6 The dependence of the homology class in (4.6) on Riemannian metrics and symplectic forms

In this subsection we shall prove that the homology class in (4.6) is invariant under the weak deformation of (M,ω,J,μ). As before we assume that $\text{suppt}(\wedge_{i=1}^m \alpha_i)$ is contained in K_0. Let $(M,\omega_t,J_t,\mu_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ be a weak deformation of the geometrically bounded symplectic manifold (M,ω,J,μ). Take a positive constant C satisfying the following property:

$$C > 6 + \frac{4\beta_0}{\pi\gamma_0^2 r_0}\omega(A).$$

Then for $K_j := \{q \in M \,|\, d(q,K_0) \le jC\},\ j = 1,2,\cdots$, by the third condition in (1.3) we have

$$\cup_{t\in[0,1]}\{\text{Im}(\mathbf{f}) \,|\, \mathbf{f} \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_t,A;K_3)\} \subset K_4.$$

Since K_4 is compact, for any $t \in (0,1]$ we can use $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_s,A;K_3),\ s \in [0,t]$ to construct a virtual moduli chain cobordsim between the virtual moduli chain associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_0,A;K_3)$ and one with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J_t,A;K_3)$. As in §4.5 we can easily show that

$$[\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega_t,\mu_t,J_t,A)] = [\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)] \quad \forall t \in [0,1].$$

Remark 4.7. In the above arguments all almost complex structures are assumed to belong to $\mathcal{J}(M,\omega,\mu)$. Actually, all arguments from §2.1 to this subsection are still valid for all almost complex structures in $\mathcal{J}_\tau(M,\omega,\mu)$.

4.7 The case of a compact symplectic manifold with contact type boundaries.

Similar to the case of closed symplectic manifolds in Remark 4.5 we may follow a way given in [Lu2] to use the above techniques to construct a virtual fundamental class $[\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,\langle\omega\rangle_c,A)]\in H_r(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\times M^m;\mathbb{Q})$ which may be used to define GW-invariants. Hereafter $\langle\omega\rangle_c$ always denote the deformation class of ω with contact type boundary. We below will give it as a consequence of Theorem 1.1 again. Recall that a compact $2n$-dimensional manifold (M,ω) with boundary is said to have contact type boundary ∂M if there exists a positive contact form λ on ∂M such that $d\lambda=\omega|_{\partial M}$. The positivity of λ means that $\lambda\wedge(d\lambda)^{n-1}$ gives the natural orientation on ∂M induced by ω^n. Note that for such a manifold (M,ω) one may always associate a noncompact symplectic manifold, denoted $(\widetilde{M},\widetilde{\omega})$ such that

$$\widetilde{M}=M\cup_{\partial M\times\{1\}}(\partial M\times[1,+\infty)\quad\text{and}$$

$$\widetilde{\omega}=\begin{cases}\omega & \text{on } M\\ d(z\lambda) & \text{on } \partial M\times[1,+\infty),\end{cases}\tag{4.27}$$

where z is the projection on the second factor. There is a class of important almost complex structures on $\partial M\times[1,+\infty)$. Let $\xi_\lambda=\mathrm{Ker}(\lambda)$ and X_λ be the Reeb vector field determined by $i_{X_\lambda}\lambda=1$ and $i_{X_\lambda}(d\lambda)=0$. Using the natural splitting $T(\partial M)=\mathbb{R}X_\lambda\oplus\xi_\lambda$ and a given complex structure $\hat{J}\in\mathcal{J}(\xi_\lambda,d\lambda|_{\xi_\lambda})$ on the bundle $\xi_\lambda\to\partial M$ we get a $\widetilde{\omega}$-compatible almost complex structure on $\partial M\times[1,+\infty)$ as follows:

$$\bar{J}(z,x)(h,k)=(-\lambda(x)(k),\hat{J}(x)(k-\lambda(x)(k)X_\lambda(x))+hX_\lambda(x))\tag{4.28}$$

for $h\in\mathbb{R}\cong T_z\mathbb{R}$ and $k\in T_x(\partial M)$. The corresponding compatible metric $g_{\bar{J}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}g_{\bar{J}}(z,x)((h_1,k_1),(h_2,k_2)) &= g_{\hat{J}}(x)(k_1-\lambda(x)(k_1)X_\lambda(x),k_2-\lambda(x)(k_2)X_\lambda(x))\\ &+ h_1\cdot h_2+\lambda(x)(k_1)\cdot\lambda(x)(k_2)\end{aligned}$$

for $h_1,h_2\in\mathbb{R}$ and $k_1,k_2\in T_x(\partial M)$. Therefore we get

$$\begin{cases}|\widetilde{\omega}((h_1,k_1),(h_2,k_2))|\le\|(h_1,k_1)\|_{g_{\bar{J}}}\cdot\|(h_2,k_2)\|_{g_{\bar{J}}},\\ \|(h_1,k_1)\|^2_{g_{\bar{J}}}=\|k_1-\lambda(x)(k_1)X_\lambda(x)\|^2_{g_{\hat{J}}}+h_1^2+(\lambda(x)(k_1))^2.\end{cases}\tag{4.29}$$

Fix a Riemannian metric μ_1 on ∂M. The product of it with the standard metric τ on $[1,+\infty)$ may be extended to a Riemannian metric on $\widetilde{M}$, denoted by μ. By Lemma 2.2 of [Lu1] it is easily proved that μ is a geometrically bounded Riemannian metric on $\widetilde{M}$. Since M is compact there exist constants $0<\gamma_1(\lambda,\hat{J})\le 1\le\gamma_2(\lambda,\hat{J})$ such that for any $v\in T(\partial M)$,

$$\gamma_1(\lambda,\hat{J})\|v\|_{\mu_1}\le\sqrt{\|v-\lambda(v)X_\lambda\|_{g_{\hat{J}}}+|\lambda(v)|^2}\le\gamma_2(\lambda,\hat{J})\|v\|_{\mu_1}$$

This and (4.29) give

$$\begin{cases}\gamma_1(\lambda,\hat{J})\|X_1\|_\mu\le\|X_1\|_{g_{\bar{J}}}\le\gamma_2(\lambda,\hat{J})\|X_1\|_\mu,\\ |\widetilde{\omega}(X_1,X_2)|\le\gamma_2(\lambda,\hat{J})^2\|X_1\|_\mu\cdot\|X_2\|_\mu\end{cases}\tag{4.30}$$

for $X_1 = (h_1, k_1), X_2 = (h_2, k_2) \in T\widetilde{M}$.

By Proposition 1.2.1 in [IS] each $J \in \mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ can be extended to a $\widetilde{\omega}$-compatible almost complex structure $\tilde{J}$ on $\widetilde{M}$ such that $\tilde{J} = \bar{J}$ on $\partial M \times [2, +\infty)$ and thus $g_{\tilde{J}} = g_{\bar{J}}$ on $\partial M \times [2, +\infty)$. Clearly, by decreasing $\gamma_1(\lambda, \hat{J})$ and increasing $\gamma_2(\lambda, \hat{J})$ we can assume

$$\gamma_1(\lambda, \hat{J})\|X_1\|_\mu \le \|X_1\|_{g_{\tilde{J}}} \le \gamma_2(\lambda, \hat{J})\|X_1\|_\mu, \ \forall X_1 \in T\widetilde{M}. \tag{4.31}$$

This and (4.30) show that $\tilde{J} \in \mathcal{J}(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{\omega}, \mu)$.

Since $M \subset \widetilde{M}$ is a proper deformation retract there exists a natural isomorphism $H^*_c(M; \mathbb{Q}) \cong H^*_c(\widetilde{M}; \mathbb{Q})$. So the cohomology classes $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m \in H^*_c(M; \mathbb{Q})$ may naturally be viewed as classes in $H^*_c(\widetilde{M}; \mathbb{Q})$. Let $\kappa \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}, \mathbb{Q})$; by Theorem 1.1 we have a rational number

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\widetilde{\omega}, \mu, \tilde{J})}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m). \tag{4.32}$$

Seemingly, it depends on ω, λ, J and μ_1, $\hat{J}$. Actually this number is independent of their suitable choices. Firstly, for two Riemannian metrics $\mu_1^{(0)}$ and $\mu_1^{(1)}$ on ∂M let $\mu^{(0)}$ and $\mu^{(1)}$ be the corresponding metrics on $\widetilde{M}$ obtained by $\mu_1^{(0)}$ and $\mu_1^{(1)}$ as above. Since the set of all Riemannian metrics on a manifold is convex we get a family of Riemannian metrics on $\widetilde{M}$, $\mu^{(t)} = (1-t)\mu^{(0)} + t\mu^{(1)}$ with $t \in [0, 1]$. Note that $\mu^{(t)} = ((1-t)\mu_1^{(0)} + t\mu_1^{(1)}) \times \tau$ outside $M \subset \widetilde{M}$. It is not hard to prove that $(\mu^{(t)})_{t\in[0,1]}$ is a continuous path in $\mathcal{GR}(\widetilde{M})$ with respect to the C^∞-strong topology. Therefore Theorem 1.1(iii) implies that (4.32) does not depend on μ_1 (and thus μ).

Next for a smooth path $(J_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{J}(M, \omega)$ and a smooth path $(\hat{J}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{J}(\xi_\lambda, d\lambda|_{\xi_\lambda})$ we may extend $(J_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ into a smooth path $(\tilde{J}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{\omega})$ such that $\tilde{J}_t = \bar{J}_t$ on $\partial M \times [2, +\infty)$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$. Here $\bar{J}_t$ is obtained by replacing $\hat{J}$ with $\hat{J}_t$ in (4.28). One easily proves that (4.31) uniformly hold for all $\hat{J}_t$, $\tilde{J}_t$ and suitable positive constants $\gamma_1(\lambda, \{\hat{J}_t\})$ and $\gamma_2(\lambda, \{\hat{J}_t\})$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1(ii) we can show that (4.32) is independent of choices of $\hat{J}$ and J.

Thirdly, we show that (4.32) is independent of choices of λ. Let us denote by

$$\mathrm{Cont}_+(M, \partial M, \omega)$$

the set of the positive contact form λ on ∂M such that $d\lambda = \omega|_{\partial M}$. It was proved in Lemma 2.1 of [Lu2] that $\mathrm{Cont}_+(M, \partial M, \omega)$ is a convex set. Thus any two points λ_0, λ_1 in $\mathrm{Cont}_+(M, \partial M, \omega)$ may be connected with a smooth path $(\lambda_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathrm{Cont}_+(M, \partial M, \omega)$. Using (4.27) and (4.28) we obtain a path $(\widetilde{\omega}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of symplectic forms on $\widetilde{M}$ and a path $(\tilde{J}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ in $\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{\omega})$ that are continuous with respect to the C^∞-strong topology. Moreover, each $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{\omega}, \tilde{J}, \mu)$ is geometrically bounded. By Theorem 1.1(iii) we have

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\widetilde{\omega}_1, \mu, \tilde{J}_1)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) = \mathcal{GW}^{(\widetilde{\omega}_0, \mu, \tilde{J}_0)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m).$$

Finally, we study the dependence of (4.32) on ω. Note that there exists an arbitrary small deformation of a symplectic form ω for which ∂M is not of contact type. Thus we must restrict to a class of deformations of the form ω. A deformation of the symplectic form ω on M, $(\omega_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ starting at $\omega_0 = \omega$, is called a *deformation with contact type boundary* if each (M, ω_t) is a symplectic manifold with contact type boundary. Since each ω_t is exact near ∂M we may construct a smooth family of 1-forms $(\lambda_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ such that each λ_t belongs to $\mathrm{Cont}_+(M,\partial M,\omega_t)$. They give a deformation $(\widetilde{\omega}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of symplectic forms on $\widetilde{M}$ by (4.27). Using these and a given metric μ_1 on ∂M we may construct a continuous path $(\hat{J}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ and thus a continuous path $(\tilde{J}_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ of almost complex structures on $\widetilde{M}$ (with respect to the C^∞ strong topology) with $\tilde{J}_t\in\mathcal{J}(\widetilde{M},\widetilde{\omega}_t,\mu)$. By Theorem 1.1(iii) we get that

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\widetilde{\omega}_t,\mu,\tilde{J}_t)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\mathcal{GW}^{(\widetilde{\omega}_0,\mu,\tilde{J}_0)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m).$$

for any $t\in[0,1]$. Summing up the previous arguments yields

Corollary 4.7. *Given a compact $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold (M,ω) with contact type boundary, and integers $g\ge 0$, $m>0$ with $2g+m\ge 3$, and a class $A\in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$ the map*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{M,\langle\omega\rangle_c}_{A,g,m}:H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m};\mathbb{Q})\times H^*_c(M;\mathbb{Q})^{\otimes m}\to\mathbb{Q}$$

given by $\mathcal{GW}^{M,\langle\omega\rangle_c}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m):=\mathcal{GW}^{(\widetilde{\omega},\mu,\tilde{J})}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)$ is well-defined and independent of all related choices.

5 The properties of Gromov-Witten invariants

This section will discuss the deep properties of the invariants constructed in §4.

5.1 The localization formulas

The following two localization formulas may be used to simplify the computation for the Gromov-Witten invariants. They show that it is sometime enough to use the smaller moduli space to construct a (local) virtual moduli cycle for computation of some concrete GW-invariants. Some special forms of them perhaps appeared in past literatures. We here explicitly propose and prove them in generality.

Let $\Lambda\subset\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J)$ be a nonempty compact subset. For given classes $\alpha_1\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ and $\alpha_2,\cdots,\alpha_m\in H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$, as before we fix a compact subset $K_0\subset M$ containing $\mathrm{supp}(\wedge_{i=1}^m\alpha_i)$ such that $\Lambda\subset\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J;K_3)$. Now replacing $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J;K_3)$ with Λ we take finitely many points $[\mathbf{f}_i]\in\Lambda$, $i=1,\cdots,k$, the corresponding uniformizers $\pi_i:\widetilde{W}_i=\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}_i}\to W_i$ and $\Gamma_i=\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{f}_i)$-invariant partially smooth cut-off function β_i on $\widetilde{W}_i$ to satisfy

$$\cap_{i=1}^k W_i=\emptyset\quad\text{and}\quad\cup_{i=1}^k V_i^0\supset\Lambda\tag{5.1}$$

for $\widetilde{V}_i^0:=\mathrm{Int}(\{x\in\widetilde{W}_i\,|\,\beta_i(x)=1\})$ and $V_i^0=\pi_i(\widetilde{V}_i^0)$, $i=1,\cdots,k$. As in §3 let $\tilde{s}_{i1},\cdots,\tilde{s}_{iq_i}$ be the chosen desired sections of the bundles $\widetilde{E}_i\to\widetilde{W}_i$, $i=1,\cdots,k$. Using these data and repeating the arguments in §3 we can construct a system of bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*,\widehat{V}^*)=\{(\widehat{E}^*_I,\widehat{V}^*_I),\ \hat{\pi}_I\,|\,I\in\mathcal{N}_k\}$ and a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains in $\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}_k}V_I^*\subset\cup_{i=1}^kV_i^0$ of dimension $2m+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)$

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0,\Lambda):=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_k}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0,\Lambda)\to\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)\},$$

for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ associated with Λ. Here $q = q_1 + \cdots + q_k$ and $\mathcal{N}_k$ the collection of the subset I of $\{1, \cdots, k\}$ with $W_I = \cap_{i\in I} W_i \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\mathcal{W}(\Lambda)$ is only a neighborhood of Λ in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$, which may be required to be arbitrarily close to Λ.

Now replacing $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m} \circ \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ in (4.2) by $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m} \circ \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0, \Lambda)$ we, as in §4.1, have the corresponding fibre product $C(\Lambda, K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I$ to (4.3) and a rational cycle

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda, K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A) \\ &= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_k} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\Pi^I_{g,m} : C(\Lambda, K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ of dimension $r = 2c_1(M)(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + 2m - \sum_{i=1}^m \deg\alpha_i$, which corresponds to (4.5). If $r < 0$ it is an empty set. In particular we get a homology class

$$[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda, K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)] \in H_r(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}, \mathbb{Q}), \tag{5.3}$$

corresponding with (4.6). As in §4 we can prove that it is independent of all related choices. We call this class or the Poincaré dual of it the *Gromov-Witten class relative to* Λ. Our first localization formula is

Theorem 5.1. *Let* $2g + m \geq 3$ *and* $\mathrm{supp}(\mathrm{EV}^*_{g,m}(\prod_{i=1}^m \alpha_i)) \subset \Lambda$. *Then*

$$[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda, K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)] = [\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)] \tag{5.4}$$

and thus for any homology class $\kappa \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}; \mathbb{Q})$ *satisfying (1.5) it holds that*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) = \langle PD(\kappa), [\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda, K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)]\rangle.$$

Proof. On the basis of the previous choices we furthermore take points

$$[\mathbf{f}_i] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3) \setminus \Lambda,\ i = k+1, \cdots, l,$$

the corresponding uniformizers $\widetilde{W}_i$ and the Γ_i-invariant functions β_i, $i = k+1, \cdots, l$. Let $\tilde s_{i1} \cdots, \tilde s_{iq_i}$ be the chosen desired sections of all bundles $\widetilde{E}_i \to \widetilde{W}_i$, $i = k+1, \cdots, l$. Since $\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)$ is a neighborhood of Λ in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ we can assume

$$\Lambda \cap W_i = \emptyset,\ i = k+1, \cdots, l. \tag{5.5}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{N}_l$ the collection of the subset I of $\{1, \cdots, l\}$ with $W_I = \cap_{i\in I} W_i \neq \emptyset$. Starting from $\widetilde{W}_i$, $\tilde s_{i1}, \cdots, \tilde s_{iq_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, l$ we can repeat the arguments in §3 to construct a system of bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{*\prime}, \widehat{V}^{*\prime}) = \{(\widehat{E}^{*\prime}_I, \widehat{V}^{*\prime}_I), \hat\pi'_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}_l\}$ and a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains in $\mathcal{W}^{*\prime} = \cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}_l} V^{*\prime}_I$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0) := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_l} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi'_I : \mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0) \to \mathcal{W}^{*\prime}\}$$

for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$ associated with Λ. Here $q' = q_1 + \cdots + q_l$. Let

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_l} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\Pi^I_{g,m} : C(K_0; \{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}$$

be the rational cycle in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ obtained from $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ as in (4.5). Note that $\mathcal{N}_k \subset \mathcal{N}_l$ and that $\Gamma'_I = \Gamma_I$ for any $I \in \mathcal{N}_k$. By (5.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A) \\ &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}_k} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \{\Pi^I_{g,m} : C(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Note that $\widehat{V}^{*\prime}_I \subset \widehat{V}^*_I$ for $I \in \mathcal{N}_k$ and that $\mathrm{suppt}(\mathrm{EV}^*_{g,m}(\wedge_{i=1}^m \alpha_i))$ is contained in $\Lambda \subset \cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}_k} V^{*\prime}_I$. By the arguments in §4.1 it is not hard to see that when restricted on $\cup_{I \in \mathcal{N}_k} V^{*\prime}_I$ the virtual moduli chains $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}(K_0, \Lambda)$ are cobordant for sufficiently small $\mathbf{t} = (\mathbf{t}^{(1)}, \mathbf{t}^{(2)}) \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon'}(\mathbb{R}^{q'})$ with $\mathbf{t}^{(1)} \in \mathbf{B}^{res}_{\varepsilon}(\mathbb{R}^q)$. It follows that the rational cycles as in (5.2) and (5.6), $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}^{(1)}}_g(\Lambda, K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)$ are cobordant. This leads to (5.4). $\square$

Note that for each nonempty compact subset $G \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ the set

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3, G) := \{[\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3) \,|\, \Pi_{g,m}([\mathbf{f}]) \subset G\}$$

is a compact subset of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3)$. Take $\Lambda = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3, G)$ we have

Corollary 5.2. *Let $2g + m \geq 3$ and (1.5) hold. If a homology class $\kappa \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}; \mathbb{Q})$ has a cycle representative with the image set contained in G then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) &= \langle PD(\kappa), [\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)]\rangle \\ &= \langle PD(\kappa), [\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda, K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)]\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Now we are a position to give the second localization formula. Denote by $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m} := (\Pi_{g,m})^{-1}(S)$ and $\mathcal{E}^{M,S}_{A,g,m} := \mathcal{E}^M_{A,g,m}|_{\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}}$, and by $\Pi^s_{g,m}$ and $\mathrm{EV}^s_{g,m}$ the restrictions of $\Pi_{g,m}$ and $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m}$ to $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$ respectively. Since S is a compact suborbifold of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$, $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3, S)$ is a compact subset of $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$. For each point $[\mathbf{f}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3, S)$ we can, as before, construct a neighborhood $W^s_{\mathbf{f}}$ of $[\mathbf{f}]$ in $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$ and a uniformizer $\pi^s_{\mathbf{f}} : \widetilde{W}^s_{\mathbf{f}} \to W^s_{\mathbf{f}}$ with uniformization group $\Gamma^s_{\mathbf{f}}$. Repeating the arguments in §3 and §4 we can construct a virtual moduli chain of dimension $2k + 2c_1(A) + 2n - 2ng$

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_S(K_0) := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}^s} \frac{1}{|\Gamma^s_I|} \{\hat{\pi}^s_I : \mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_{SI}(K_0) \to \mathcal{W}^*_S\}$$

in some neighborhood $\mathcal{W}^*_S$ of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3, S)$ in $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J; K_3, S)$.

As above we replace $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m} \circ \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ in (4.2) by $\mathrm{EV}_{g,m} \circ \mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_S(K_0)$ and get the corresponding fibre product $C_S(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I$ with (4.3) and a rational cycle

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_S = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|} \{\Pi^I_{g,m} : C_S(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)^{\mathbf{t}}_I \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\}.$$

in S of dimension $r_s = 2c_1(M)(A) + 2k + 2n(1-g) - \sum_{i=1}^m \deg \alpha_i$. The latter corresponds to (4.5). If $r_s < 0$ it is an empty set. In particular we get a homology class

$$[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_S] \in H_{r_s}(S, \mathbb{Q}),$$

corresponding with (4.6). As in §4 we can prove that it is independent of all related choices. We call this class or the Poincaré dual of it the *Gromov-Witten class with value in* $H_*(S,\mathbb{Q})$.

Note that $\mathrm{codim}(\kappa)$ in (1.5) is equal to $6g-6+2m-j$. But the codimension $\mathrm{codim}_S(\kappa)$ of κ in S is equal to $2k-j$. Therefore (1.5) implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\deg\alpha_i+\mathrm{codim}_S(\kappa)=2c_1(M)(A)+2n-2ng+2k. \tag{5.7}$$

We define

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m):=\langle PD_S(\kappa),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_S]\rangle, \tag{5.8}$$

and $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=0$ if (1.5) (or (5.7)) is not satisfied. As in §4 we may prove that $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)$ has the similar properties to Theorem 1.1. Our second localization formula is

Theorem 5.3. *Under the above assumptions it holds that*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m). \tag{5.9}$$

Proof. From the arguments above Proposition 5.1 we can take finitely many points $[\mathbf{f}_i]\in\Lambda:=\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J;K_3,S)$, $i=1,\cdots,k$, to construct a system of bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*,\widehat{V}^*)=\{(\widehat{E}^*_I,\widehat{V}^*_I),\ \hat\pi_I\mid I\in\mathcal{N}_k\}$, and then choose sections $\tilde s_{ij}:\widetilde{W}_i\to\widetilde{E}_i$, $i=1,\cdots,k$ and $j=1,\cdots,q_i$ to construct a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains in $\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)\subset\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ of dimension $2m+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)$

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0,\Lambda)=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_k}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0,\Lambda)\to\mathcal{W}^*(\Lambda)\}$$

for any $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J;K_3,S)$. Here $q=q_1+\cdots+q_k$. They determine a rational homology class as in (5.3). By Corollary 5.2 we have

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\langle PD(\kappa),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda,K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]\rangle \tag{5.10}$$

Let R_S be a retraction from a tubular neighborhood of S in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ onto S, and $PD_S(\kappa)$ (resp. $PD(S)$) be the Poincaré dual of κ in $H^*(S,\mathbb{Q})$ (resp. S in $H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\mathbb{Q})$). Since one can take a closed form representative S^* of $PD(S)$ with support in the tubular neighborhood, for any closed form κ^*_S representing $PD_S(\kappa)$ we get such a closed representative form $\kappa^*:=R^*_S(\kappa^*_S)\cup S^*$ of the Poincaré dual $PD(\kappa)$ in $H^{6g-6+2m-j}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\mathbb{Q})$ of $\kappa\in H_j(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m},\mathbb{Q})$. So (5.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)&=\int_{\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda,K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)}R^*_S(\kappa^*_S)\cup S^* \\ &=\int_{S\cap\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(\Lambda,K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)}\kappa^*_S.\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Let $W^s_i=W_i\cap\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$, $\widetilde{W}^s_i=\pi_i^{-1}(W^s_i)$, $\beta^s_i=\beta_i|_{\widetilde{W}^s_i}$ and $\tilde s^s_{ij}=\tilde s_{ij}|_{\widetilde{W}^s_i}$, $\pi^s_i=\pi_i|_{\widetilde{W}^s_i}$, $i=1,\cdots,k$, and $j=1,\cdots,q_i$. As before we assume that

$$W^1_i\subset\subset U^1_i\subset\subset W^2_i\subset\subset U^2_i\cdots\subset\subset W^{k-1}_i\subset\subset U^{k-1}_i\subset\subset W^k_i=W_i,$$

$i = 1, \cdots, k$ are the pairs of open subsets constructing $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0, \Lambda)$ above. Set

$$W_i^{js} = W_i^j \cap \mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m} \quad \text{and} \quad U_i^{js} = U_i^j \cap \mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m},$$

then $\widetilde{W}_i^{js} = (\pi_i^s)^{-1}(W_i^{js}) = \pi_i^{-1}(W_i^{js})$ and $\widetilde{U}_i^{js} = (\pi_i^s)^{-1}(U_i^{js}) = \pi_i^{-1}(U_i^{js})$. As in (3.62), for each $I \in \mathcal{N}_k$ with $|I| = r$ we define

$$V_I^s := \Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} W_i^{rs}\Big) \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{J:|J|>r}\big(\bigcap_{j\in J} Cl(U_j^{rs})\big)\Big)$$

and $V_I^{s*} = V_I^* \cap V_I^s$. Then it is not hard to check that V_I^s and V_I^{s*} are equal to $V_I \cap \mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$ and $V_I^* \cap \mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$ respectively. It follows that the corresponding system of bundles produced from them $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{s*}, \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^{s*}) = \{(\widehat{E}_I^{s*}, \widehat{V}_I^{s*}),\, \hat{\pi}_I^s \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}_k\}$ is equal to the restriction of the system of bundles $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^*, \widehat{V}^*) = \{(\widehat{E}_I^*, \widehat{V}_I^*),\, \hat{\pi}_I \,|\, I \in \mathcal{N}_k\}$ to $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$. By increasing the number of the sections $\tilde{s}_{ij}$ if necessary we may assume that the restriction of the section $\Psi_I^{(\mathbf{t})}$ in Corollary 3.15 to $(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^{s*}, \widehat{\mathcal{V}}^{s*})$ is transversal to the zero section. It follows from that the rational cycle $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_S$ in S associated with it is equal to the intersection of S with the rational cycle $\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(\Lambda, K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle PD_S(\kappa), [\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_S]\rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_S} \kappa_S^* \\ &= \int_{S\cap\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)} \kappa_S^*.\end{aligned}$$

This and (5.11) together give rise to

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) \\ &= \langle PD_S(\kappa), [\mathcal{C}_g^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0; \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m; \omega, \mu, J, A)_S]\rangle \\ &= \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m).\end{aligned}$$

□

A special case of the formula (5.9) is the corresponding form of the formula (4.49) in [R]. For the invariant $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}$ we may also obtain a similar localization formula to Theorem 5.1.

5.2 The composition laws

The composition laws for the Gromov-Witten invariants are the most useful properties. To state them we assume that $g = g_1 + g_2$ and $m = m_1 + m_2$ with $2g_i + m_i \geq 3$. Following [KM] we fix a decomposition $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ of $\{1, \cdots, m\}$ with $|Q_i| = m_i$ and then get a canonical embedding $\varphi_Q : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$, which assigns marked curves $(\Sigma_i, z_1^{(i)}, \cdots, z_{m_i+1}^{(i)})$($i = 1, 2$) to their union $\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$ with $z^{(1)}_{m_1+1}$ identified to $z_1^{(2)}$ and remaining points renumbered by $\{1, \cdots, m\}$ in such a way that their relative order is kept intact and points on Σ_i are numbered by S_i. There is also another natural embedding $\psi : \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ obtained by gluing together the last two marked points. So $\varphi_Q(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1})$ is a compact complex suborbifold of

$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ of complex dimension $3g-4+m$, and $\psi(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2})$ is a compact complex suborbifold of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ complex dimension $3g-4+m$.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that* $\dim H^*(M) < \infty$ *and that* $\{\beta_i\}$ *is a basis of the vector space* $H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$. *By Remark 5.7 of [BoTu] one has the Poincaré duality:* $H^p(M) \cong (H_c^{n-p}(M))^*$ *for any integer* p. *Thus* $\dim H_c^*(M,\mathbb{Q}) = \dim H^*(M) < \infty$ *and we may choose a dual basis* $\{\omega_i\}$ *of* $\{\beta_i\}$ *in* $H_c^*(M)$, *i.e.,* $\langle\omega_i,\beta_j\rangle = \langle\omega_i\wedge\beta_j,[M]\rangle = \int_M \omega_i\wedge\beta_j = \delta_{ij}$. *Then the Poincaré dual* $PD^{\rm II}([\Delta_M])$ *of the class* $[\Delta_M]\in H_{2n}^{\rm II}(M\times M,\mathbb{Q})$ *of the diagonal* Δ_M *in* $M\times M$ *are given by*

$$PD^{\rm II}([\Delta_M]) = \sum_{\deg\beta_i+\deg\beta_j=2n} c_{ij}\rho_1^*\beta_i\wedge\rho_2^*\beta_j.$$

where ρ_k *are the projections of* $M\times M$ *to the k-th factor,* $k=1,2$, *and*

$$c_{ij} = (-1)^{\deg\omega_i\cdot\deg\omega_j}\eta^{ij} \quad\text{and}\quad \eta^{ij} = \textstyle\int_M \omega_i\wedge\omega_j.$$

Moreover, if β_i^* *are the closed form representatives of* β_i, *then* $PD^{\rm II}([\Delta_M])$ *has the closed representing form*

$$\Delta_M^* = \sum_{\deg\beta_i+\deg\beta_j=2n} c_{ij}\rho_1^*\beta_i^*\wedge\rho_2^*\beta_j^*.$$

By (4.9), $H^0(M,\mathbb{Q})=\mathbb{Q}$ and $H^{2n}(M,\mathbb{Q})=0$. So each $2n-\deg\beta_i = \deg\omega_i > 0$. We always assume $\beta_1 = \mathbf{1}$. Note that in general the matrix (η^{ij}) is degenerate for noncompact M. If M is a closed manifold then (η^{ij}) is invertible and $(\eta^{ij})^{-1} = (\eta_{ij})$, where $\eta_{ij} = \int_M \beta_i\wedge\beta_j$. In this case $\omega_i = \sum_j \eta^{ij}\beta_j$.

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Since $H^*(M)$ is finitely dimensional it follows from the Künneth formula (cf. Proposition 9.12 in [BoTu]) that $\{\beta_i\otimes\beta_j\}$ form a basis $H^*(M\times M,\mathbb{Q})$. (This is a unique place where $\dim H^*(M)<\infty$ is used.) So $PD^{\rm II}([\Delta_M])\in H^{2n}(M\times M)$ and $[\Delta_M]\in H_{2n}^{\rm II}(M\times M)$ can be written as

$$\textstyle\sum_{i,j} c_{ij}\beta_i\otimes\beta_j \quad\text{and}\quad \sum_{i,j} c_{ij}(PD^{\rm II})^{-1}(\beta_i)\otimes(PD^{\rm II})^{-1}(\beta_j)$$

respectively. Now on one hand

$$\begin{aligned}\langle[\Delta_M],\rho_1^*[\omega_k]\wedge\rho_2^*[\omega_l]\rangle &= \int_{\Delta_M}\rho_1^*\omega_k\wedge\rho_2^*\omega_l\\ &= \int_M \imath^*\rho_1^*\omega_k\wedge\imath^*\rho_2^*\omega_l = \int_M \omega_k\wedge\omega_l,\end{aligned}$$

where $\imath: M\to\Delta_M\subset M\times M$ is the diagonal map. On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle[\Delta_M],\rho_1^*[\omega_k]\wedge\rho_2^*[\omega_l]\rangle\\ &=\sum_{i,j} c_{ij}\langle(PD^{\rm II})^{-1}(\beta_i)\otimes(PD^{\rm II})^{-1}(\beta_j),\rho_1^*[\omega_k]\wedge\rho_2^*[\omega_l]\rangle\\ &=\sum_{i,j} c_{ij}(-1)^{\deg\beta_i\cdot\deg\beta_j}\langle[\omega_k],(PD^{\rm II})^{-1}(\beta_i)\rangle\langle[\omega_l],(PD^{\rm II})^{-1}(\beta_j)\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

So $c_{ij} = (-1)^{\deg\beta_i\cdot\deg\beta_j}\int_M \omega_i\wedge\omega_j = (-1)^{\deg\omega_i\cdot\deg\omega_j}\int_M \omega_i\wedge\omega_j$ because $\deg(PD^{\rm II})^{-1}(\beta_i) = 2n-\deg\beta_i = \deg\omega_i$. By the definition of the Poincaré dual of a closed oriented submanifold on the page 51 of [BoTu], using the similar reason one may readily prove the second statement because $c_{ij}\ne 0$ implies that $\deg\omega_i+\deg\omega_j = \dim M = 2n$ and thus that $\deg\beta_i\deg\omega_i+\deg\beta_j\deg\omega_j$ is even. □

Theorem 5.5. *Assume that* $\dim H^*(M)<\infty$. *Let* $\kappa\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2},\mathbb{Q})$, *and* $\alpha_i\in H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$, $i=1,\cdots,m$. *Suppose that some* $\alpha_t\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$. *Then*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\psi_*(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m) = \sum_{i,j} c_{ij}\cdot\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g-1,m+2}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m,\beta_i,\beta_j)$$

Proof. Take a compact subset $K_0\subset M$ containing $\mathrm{supp}(\wedge_{i=1}^m\alpha_i)$. Since ψ is an embedding $S:=\psi(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2})$ is a compact complex suborbifold of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$ complex dimension $3g-4+m$. Consider the evaluation

$$\Xi:\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g-1,m+2}\to M\times M$$

given by $[\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}},f]\mapsto(f(z_{m+1}),f(z_{m+2})$. There is a map $\Psi:\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)\to\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$, which is a lifting of ψ, such that the following commutative diagram holds:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M) \arrow[r, "\Psi"] \arrow[d, "\Pi^r_{g-1,m+2}"'] & \mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m} \arrow[d, "\Pi_{g,m}"'] \\
\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2} \arrow[r, "\psi"] & \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here $\Pi^r_{g-1,m+2}$ is the restriction of $\Pi_{g-1,m+2}$ to $\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$. For $[\mathbf{f}]\in\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g-1,m+2}$ let $\pi_{\mathbf{f}}:\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}\to W_{\mathbf{f}}$ be a uniformizer of a neighborhood of $[\mathbf{f}]$ in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g-1,m+2}$ constructed in §2.4. One has a natural lifting $\widetilde{\Xi}_{\mathbf{f}}:\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}\to M\times M$ of Ξ given by $(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}},f)\mapsto(f(z_{m+1}),f(z_{m+2})$. It is easily checked that $\widetilde{\Xi}_{\mathbf{f}}$ is transversal to the diagonal $\triangle_M$ and that $(\widetilde{\Xi}_{\mathbf{f}})^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ is invariant under the action of group $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}=\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{f})$. Therefore $(\widetilde{\Xi}_{\mathbf{f}})^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ is a $\Gamma_{\mathbf{f}}$-invariant stratified Banach submanifold of $\widetilde{W}_{\mathbf{f}}$. It may follow that $\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ is a stratified Banach suborbifold of $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g-1,m+2}$ and that $\pi_{\mathbf{f}}:(\widetilde{\Xi}_{\mathbf{f}})^{-1}(\Delta_M)\to W_{\mathbf{f}}\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ gives a uniformizer of a neighborhood of $[\mathbf{f}]$ in $\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$. Note that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3)\ne\emptyset$ implies that $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}(M,J,A;K_3)\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)\ne\emptyset$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.3 we first choose finitely many points $[\mathbf{f}_1],\cdots,[\mathbf{f}_k]$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}(M,J,A;K_3)\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ and then choose finitely many points $[\mathbf{f}_{k+1}],\cdots,[\mathbf{f}_l]$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}(M,J,A;K_3)\setminus\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}(M,J,A;K_3)\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ to construct a virtual moduli chain

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_l}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to\mathcal{W}^*\}$$

of dimension $2(m+2)+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-2)$ in $\mathcal{W}^*=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}_r}V_I^*\subset\mathcal{W}$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}(M,J,A;K_3)$. As in §4.1 we can use it to get a rational cycle

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^m,PD^{II}(\Delta_M);\omega,\mu,J,A)\tag{5.12}$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}$ and its homology class

$$[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m, PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\omega,\mu,J,A)]$$

in $H_{r_1}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2},\mathbb{Q})$ for $r_1 = 2c_1(A)+2m+2(3-n)(g-1)-2-\sum_{i=1}^m \deg\alpha_i$.

Since $f_i(z^{(i)}_{m+1}) \neq f_i(z^{(i)}_{m+2})$ for $i=k+1,\cdots,l$ we can require

$$(\cup_{i=k+1}^l W_i)\cap \Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)=\emptyset.$$

Recall that the constructions of the virtual moduli chains in §3. It is not hard using our above arguments to show that for $\mathcal{N}_k := \{I\in\mathcal{N}_l \mid \max(I)\le k\}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)}(K_0) := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_k}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi_{Ir}:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_r\to\mathcal{W}^*\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)\}$$

is a virtual moduli chain of dimension $2(m+2)+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-2)-2n$ in $\mathcal{W}^*\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}(M,J,A;K_3)\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$, where $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_r = (\Xi\circ\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ and $\hat\pi_{Ir}$ denotes the restriction of $\hat\pi_I$ to $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_r$. (This actually implies that $\Xi\circ\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to M\times M$ is transversal to Δ_M.) As in §4.1 we use $(\prod_{i=1}^m ev_i)\circ\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)}(K_0)$ to construct a rational cycle

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A;\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M))$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2}$ and its homology class

$$[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A;\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M))]\in H_{r_1}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g-1,m+2},\mathbb{Q})$$

for $r_1 = 2c_1(A)+2m+2(3-n)(g-1)-2-\sum_{i=1}^m\deg\alpha_i$. It is easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned}&[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m, PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\omega,\mu,J,A)]\\ &=[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A;\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M))].\end{aligned}\tag{5.13}$$

Note that $\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ can be identified with $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$ via Ψ. We may consider $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)}(K_0)$ as a virtual moduli chain in $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m}$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,J,A;K_3,S)$. In this case we have

$$\psi_*[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A;\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M))] = [\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_S].\tag{5.14}$$

Then by Theorem 5.3, (5.14) and (5.13) we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\psi_*(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}(\psi_*(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &=\langle PD_S(\psi_*(\kappa)),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_S]\rangle\\ &=\langle PD(\kappa),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A;\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M))]\rangle\\ &=\langle PD(\kappa),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m, PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\omega,\mu,J,A)]\rangle\\ &=\sum_{i,j}c_{ij}\langle PD(\kappa),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g-1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m,\beta_i\otimes\beta_j;\omega,\mu,J,A)]\rangle\\ &=\sum_{i,j}c_{ij}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J,A)}_{A,g-1,m+2}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m,\beta_i,\beta_j).\end{aligned}$$

Here the fifth equality comes from Lemma 5.4. Theorem 5.5 is proved. $\Box$

For $i=1,2$, let $\kappa_i\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_i,m_i},\mathbb{Q})$, $A_i\in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$ and integers $g_i\ge 0$, $m_i>0$ satisfy $2g_i+m_i\ge 3$. Moreover assume that $\alpha_i,\gamma_k\in H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ for $i=1,\cdots,m_1$ and $k=1,\cdots,m_2$. If $\alpha_s,\gamma_t\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ for some s and t we may take a compact subset $K_0\subset M$ containing $\mathrm{supp}(\alpha_s)$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\gamma_t)$. Consider the product stratified Banach orbifold $\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1,g_1,m_1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2,g_2,m_2}$. Repeating the arguments in §3 we can construct a virtual moduli chain

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{A_i,g_i,m_i\})=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_l}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0;\{A_i,g_i,m_i\})\to\mathcal{W}\}$$

of dimension $2(m_1+m_2)+2c_1(A_1+A_2)+2(3-n)(g_1+g_2-2)$ in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1,g_1,m_1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2,g_2,m_2}$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}(M,A_1,J_1;K_3)\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2}(M,A_2,J_2;K_3)$. Using the same ideas as the proof of (4.16) of Proposition 4.3 in [Lu3] we can derive that the virtual moduli chain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{A_i,g_i,m_i\})$ induces a virtual moduli chain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;A_1,g_1,m_1)$ for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}(M,A_1,J_1;K_3)$ and that $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;A_2,g_2,m_2)$ for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2}(M,A_2,J_2;K_3)$, such that

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;\{A_i,g_i,m_i\})=\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;A_1,g_1,m_1)\times\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0;A_2,g_2,m_2).$$

As in §4.1 we can use them, α_i, $i=1,\cdots,m_1$ and γ_j, $j=1,\cdots,m_2$ to construct a rational cycle in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1};\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{m_2};A_1,A_2)\tag{5.15}$$

of dimension $2(m_1+m_2)+2c_1(A_1+A_2)+2(3-n)(g_1+g_2-2)-\sum_{i=1}^{m_1}\alpha_i-\sum_{j=1}^{m_2}\gamma_j$, and that

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g_1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1};\omega,\mu,J,A_1)$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}$ of dimension $2m_1+2c_1(A_1)+2(3-n)(g_1-1)-\sum_{i=1}^{m_1}\alpha_i$, and that

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g_2}(K_0;\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{m_2};\omega,\mu,J,A_2)$$

in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2}$ of dimension $2m_2+2c_1(A_2)+2(3-n)(g_2-1)-\sum_{j=1}^{m_2}\gamma_j$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1};\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{m_2};A_1,A_2)\\&=\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g_1}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1};\omega,\mu,J,A_1)\times\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{g_2}(K_0;\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{m_2};\omega,\mu,J,A_2).\end{aligned}$$

As in §4 we may also prove that the homology class

$$\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1};\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{m_2};A_1,A_2)\big]\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2},\mathbb{Q})\tag{5.16}$$

is independent of all related choices.

Let P_i (resp. ρ_i) be the projections of $\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1,g_1,m_1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2,g_2,m_2}$ (resp. $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2}$) to the i-th factor, $i=1,2$. For $i=1,2$ let $\mathrm{ev}^{(i)}_k$ denote the evaluation at the k-th marked point of $\mathcal{B}^M_{A_i,g_i,m_i}$, $k=1,\cdots,m_i$. If

$$\sum_{s=1}^{m_1}\deg\alpha_s+\sum_{r=1}^{m_2}\deg\gamma_r=\sum_{i=1}^{2}\Big(2c_1(M)(A_i)+2(3-n)(g_i-1)+2m_i\Big)$$

we define

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{\{A_i,g_i,m_i\}}(\kappa_1,\kappa_2;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m_1};\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_{m_2}) \\ &=(-1)^{\dim\kappa_1\dim\kappa_2}\big\langle PD(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2),\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1};\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^{m_2};A_1,A_2)\big]\big\rangle\end{aligned}\tag{5.17}$$

Otherwise we define $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{\{A_i,g_i,m_i\}}(\kappa_1,\kappa_2;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m_1};\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_{m_2})=0$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}PD(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2)\quad&=(-1)^{(6g_1-6+2m_1-\dim\kappa_1)\dim\kappa_2}PD(\kappa_1)\wedge PD(\kappa_2)\\ &=(-1)^{\dim\kappa_1\dim\kappa_2}PD(\kappa_1)\wedge PD(\kappa_2).\end{aligned}$$

Using (5.17) we get:

Lemma 5.6. *Under the above assumptions it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{\{A_i,g_i,m_i\}}(\kappa_1,\kappa_2;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m_1};\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_{m_2})\\ &=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_1,g_1,m_1}(\kappa_1;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m_1})\cdot\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_2,g_2,m_2}(\kappa_2;\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_{m_2}).\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.7. *Assume that* $\dim H^*(M)<\infty$. *Let* $\kappa_i\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_i,m_i+1},\mathbb{Q})$, $i=1,2$, *and* $\alpha_k\in H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ *for* $k=1,\cdots,m$. *Suppose that* $\alpha_s,\alpha_t\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ *for some* $s\in Q_1$ *and* $t\in Q_2$. *Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=\epsilon(Q)(-1)^{\deg\kappa_2\sum_{i\in Q_1}\deg\alpha_i}\sum_{A=A_1+A_2}\\ \sum_{k,l}\eta^{kl}\cdot\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_1,g_1,m_1+1}(\kappa_1;\{\alpha_i\}_{i\in Q_2},\beta_k)\cdot\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_2,g_2,m_2+1}(\kappa_2;\beta_l,\{\alpha_i\}_{i\in Q_2})\end{aligned}$$

Here η^{kl} *and* $\{\beta_i\}$ *are as in Lemma 5.4,* $g=g_1+g_2$, *and* $\epsilon(Q)$ *is the sign of permutation* $Q=Q_1\cup Q_2$ *of* $\{1,\cdots,m\}$ *with* $|Q_1|=m_1$ *and* $|Q_2|=m_2$.

By the explanations below Lemma 5.4 this formula is exactly the ordinary composition law if M is a closed symplectic manifold.

Proof of Theorem 5.7. Without loss of generality one may assume that $Q_1=\{1,\cdots,m_1\}$, $Q_2=\{m_1+1,\cdots,m\}$ with $m_2=m-m_1$, and $s=1$, $t=m$. Let $A_i\in H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$, $i=1,2$ and $A=A_1+A_2$. Consider the evaluation

$$\Upsilon:\bigcup_{A_1+A_2=A}\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1,g_1,m_1+1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2,g_2,m_2+1}\to\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$$

given by $([\Sigma^{(1)},\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)},f^{(1)}],[\Sigma^{(2)},\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)},f^{(2)}])\mapsto(f^{(1)}(z^{(1)}_{m_1+1}),f^{(2)}(z^{(1)}_1))$. There is a map

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_Q:\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)\to\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m},\ ([\mathbf{f}^{(1)}],[\mathbf{f}^{(2)}])\mapsto[\mathbf{f}^{(1)}\sharp_{f^{(2)}(z^{(2)}_1)}\mathbf{f}^{(2)}],$$

which is a lifting of φ_Q, such that the following commutative diagram holds:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M) \arrow[r, "\widetilde{\varphi}_Q"] \arrow[d, "\Pi_r"'] & \mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m} \arrow[d, "\Pi^A_{g,m}"'] \\
\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1} \arrow[r, "\varphi_Q"] & \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here Π_r is the restriction of $\Pi := \cup_{A_1+A_2=A}\Pi^{A_1}_{g_1,m_1+1} \times \Pi^{A_2}_{g_2,m_2+1}$ to $\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)$. Setting

$$S := \varphi_Q(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1} \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}),$$

it is a compact complex suborbifold of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$, and $\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ may be identified with $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m} = (\Pi^A_{g,m})^{-1}(S)$ via the map $\widetilde{\varphi}_Q$ naturally.

Take a compact subset $K_0 \subset M$ containing the supports of α_1 and α_m. If

$$([\mathbf{f}^{(1)}], [\mathbf{f}^{(2)}]) \in \Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M) \cap \big(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M, J, A_1) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M, J, A_2)\big)$$

such that $\widetilde{\varphi}_Q([\mathbf{f}^{(1)}], [\mathbf{f}^{(2)}])$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_3, S)$, then $A = A_1 + A_2$, and it follows from (3.17) that $[\mathbf{f}^{(1)}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M, J, A_1; K_4)$ and $[\mathbf{f}^{(2)}] \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M, J, A_2; K_4)$. Conversely, if $([\mathbf{f}^{(1)}], [\mathbf{f}^{(2)}])$ belongs to

$$\big(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M, J, A_1; K_3) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M, J, A_2; K_3)\big) \cap \Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)$$

then $\widetilde{\varphi}_Q([\mathbf{f}^{(1)}], [\mathbf{f}^{(2)}]) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_3, S)$ for $A = A_1 + A_2$. Note that there only exist finitely many different pairs $(A_1, A_2) \in H_2(M, \mathbb{Z}) \times H_2(M, \mathbb{Z})$ such that $A_1 + A_2 = A$ and $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M, J, A_1; K_4) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M, J, A_2; K_4) \neq \emptyset$. Let $(A^{(i)}_1, A^{(i)}_2)$, $i = 1, \cdots, q$, be these pairs. Set

$$\Omega := \bigcup_{i=1}^{q} \Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M) \cap (\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M, J, A^{(i)}_1; K_4) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M, J, A^{(i)}_2; K_4)),$$

then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_3, S) \subset \widetilde{\varphi}_Q(\Omega) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, J, A; K_4, S)$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.5 we first choose finitely many points in Ω,

$$[\mathbf{f}_i] = ([\mathbf{f}^{(1)}_i], [\mathbf{f}^{(2)}_i]),\ i = 1 = k_0 + 1, \cdots, k_2, \cdots, k_{q-1}, \cdots, k_q = k$$

such that

$$[\mathbf{f}_i] \in \Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M) \cap \big(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M, J, A^{(t)}_1; K_4) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M, J, A^{(t)}_2; K_4)\big)$$

for $i = k_t + 1, \cdots, k_{t+1}$, $t = 0, \cdots, q - 1$. Then we again take finitely many points

$$[\mathbf{f}_i] \in \bigcup_{t=1}^{p} \Big(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M, J, A^{(t)}_1; K_4) \times \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M, J, A^{(t)}_2; K_4)\Big) \setminus \Omega$$

for $i = k + 1, \cdots, l$. Clearly,

$$f^{(1)}_i(z^{(1)}_{m_1+1}) \neq f^{(2)}_i(z^{(2)}_1),\ i = k + 1, \cdots, l. \tag{5.18}$$

If $[\mathbf{f}_i]=([\mathbf{f}_i^{(1)}],[\mathbf{f}_i^{(2)}])\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M,J,A_1^{(t)};K_4)\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M,J,A_2^{(t)};K_4)$ we can, as before, construct the uniformizers $\pi_{si}:\widetilde{W}_{si}\to W_{si}$ of neighborhoods of $[\mathbf{f}_i^{(s)}]$ in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A_s^{(t)},g_s,m_s+1}$, $s=1,2$. Then

$$\pi_i:=\pi_{1i}\times\pi_{2i}:\widetilde{W}_i:=\widetilde{W}_{1i}\times\widetilde{W}_{2i}\to W_i:=W_{1i}\times W_{2i}$$

is a uniformizer of the neighborhood W_i of $[\mathbf{f}_i]$ in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1^{(t)},g_1,m_1+1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2^{(t)},g_2,m_2+1}$ with the uniformization group $\Gamma_i:=\Gamma_{1i}\times\Gamma_{2i}$, where $\Gamma_{si}=\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{f}_i^{(s)})$ for $s=1,2$. By (5.18) we may require

$$W_i\cap\Omega=\emptyset,\ i=k+1,\cdots,l.$$

Moreover, for each $i=1,\cdots,k$ let us denote

$$\widetilde{\Upsilon}_i:=\Upsilon\circ\pi_i:\widetilde{W}_i:=\widetilde{W}_{1i}\times\widetilde{W}_{2i}\to M\times M.$$

It is not hard to check that it is transversal to the diagonal Δ_M, and that the stratified Banach submanifold $\widetilde{\Upsilon}_i^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ is also invariant under the action of the group Γ_i. By increasing k and l if necessary we can use $\{(\pi_i,\widetilde{W}_i,W_i,\Gamma_i)\}_{i=1}^l$ to construct a virtual moduli chain

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_l}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I:\mathcal{M}_I^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)\to\mathcal{W}^*\}$$

of dimension $2(m+2)+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-2)$ in $\mathcal{W}^*\subset\mathcal{W}=\cup_{i=1}^lW_i\subset\cup_{i=1}^l\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1^{(i)},g_1,m_1+1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2^{(i)},g_2,m_2+1}$ associated with

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^q\big(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M,J,A_1^{(i)};K_4)\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M,J,A_2^{(i)};K_4)\big).$$

Let P_i be the projections of the product $\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1,g_1,m_1+1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2,g_2,m_2+1}$ to the i-th factor, $i=1,2$. Also denote by the evaluations

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ev}_j^{(1)}&:\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1,g_1,m_1+1}\to M,\ [\mathbf{f}^{(1)}]\mapsto f^{(1)}(z_j^{(1)}),\ j=1,\cdots,m_1+1,\\ \mathrm{ev}_j^{(2)}&:\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2,g_2,m_2+1}\to M,\ [\mathbf{f}^{(2)}]\mapsto f^{(2)}(z_j^{(2)}),\ j=1,\cdots,m_2+1.\end{aligned}$$

As in (5.12) we can use the virtual moduli chain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ and the evaluation $\prod_{j=1}^{m_1}\mathrm{ev}_j^{(1)}\times(\mathrm{ev}_{m_1+1}^{(1)}\times\mathrm{ev}_1^{(2)})\times\prod_{j=2}^{m_2+1}\mathrm{ev}_j^{(2)}$ to construct a rational cycle in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M),\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)\tag{5.19}$$

of dimension $r=2m+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)-2-\sum_{i=1}^m\deg\alpha_i$, and prove that its homology class

$$\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M),\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)\big]$$

in $H_r(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1},\mathbb{Q})$ is independent of all related choices. The important is that the class of the cycle in (5.19) can also be constructed from another direction. In fact we only use the virtual moduli chain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ and the evaluation $\prod_{j=1}^{m_1}\mathrm{ev}_j^{(1)}\times\prod_{j=2}^{m_2+1}\mathrm{ev}_j^{(2)}$ to construct a rational cycle in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)$$

of dimension $r = 2m + 2c_1(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) + 2n - 2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m}\alpha_i$, and can also require that the restriction of $(\mathrm{ev}^{(1)}_{m_1+1}\times \mathrm{ev}^{(2)}_1)$ to this cycle (or its domain) is transversal to $\triangle_M \subset M\times M$. So we get a rational cycle in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}$, denoted by

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m};\omega,\mu,J,A)\cap(\mathrm{ev}^{(1)}_{m_1+1}\times\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}_1)^{-1}(\triangle_M)$$

of dimension $r = 2m + 2c_1(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) - 2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m}\alpha_i$. It is not hard to check that this cycle gives the same class as one in (5.19). Namely, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M),\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m};\omega,\mu,J,A)\big] \\ &=\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m};\omega,\mu,J,A)\cap(\mathrm{ev}^{(1)}_{m_1+1}\times\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}_1)^{-1}(\triangle_M)\big].\end{aligned}\tag{5.20}$$

By the constructions of the virtual moduli chains in §3, it is not hard using our above arguments to show that for $\mathcal{N}_k := \{I\in\mathcal{N}_l \mid \max(I)\le k\}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)}(K_0) := \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_k}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat\pi_{Ir}:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_r\to\mathcal{W}^*\cap\Xi^{-1}(\Delta_M)\}$$

is a virtual moduli chain of dimension $2(m+2)+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-2)-2n$ in $\mathcal{W}^*\cap\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ associated with Ω, where $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_r = (\Upsilon\circ\hat\pi_I)^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ and $\hat\pi_{Ir}$ denotes the restriction of $\hat\pi_I$ to $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_r$. (This actually implies that $\Upsilon\circ\hat\pi_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to M\times M$ is transversal to Δ_M.) As in §4.1 we use the composition $(\prod_{j=1}^{m_1}\mathrm{ev}^{(1)}_j\times\prod_{j=2}^{m_2+1}\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}_j)\circ\hat\pi_{Ir}$ of the evaluation $\prod_{j=1}^{m_1}\mathrm{ev}^{(1)}_j\times\prod_{j=2}^{m_2+1}\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}_j$ and $\hat\pi_{Ir}$ to construct a rational cycle in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m},\omega,\mu,J,A;\Upsilon^{-1}(\triangle_M))$$

of dimension $r = 2m + 2c_1(A) + 2(3-n)(g-1) - 2 - \sum_{i=1}^{m}\alpha_i$, and prove that its homology class

$$\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m};\omega,\mu,J,A;\Upsilon^{-1}(\triangle_M))\big]$$

in $H_r(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2},\mathbb{Q})$ is independent of all related choices. It is not hard to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m},\omega,\mu,J,A;\Upsilon^{-1}(\triangle_M)) \\ &=\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},\{\bar\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m};\omega,\mu,J,A)\cap(\mathrm{ev}^{(1)}_{m_1+1}\times\mathrm{ev}^{(2)}_1)^{-1}(\triangle_M).\end{aligned}$$

This and (5.20) give rise to

$$\begin{aligned}&\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M),\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m};\omega,\mu,J,A)\big] \\ &=[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m},\omega,\mu,J,A;\Upsilon^{-1}(\triangle_M))].\end{aligned}\tag{5.21}$$

Moreover using $\widetilde{\varphi}_Q$ we can identify $\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)$ with $\mathcal{B}^{M,S}_{A,g,m} = (\Pi^A_{g,m})^{-1}(S)$. (In this case $\kappa_1\times\kappa_2\in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1},\mathbb{Q})$ is identified with $\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2)\in H_*(S,\mathbb{Q})$.) So we may consider $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{\Upsilon^{-1}(\Delta_M)}(K_0)$ as a virtual moduli chain in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J;K_3)$. In this case we have

$$\varphi_{Q*}\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m},\omega,\mu,J,A;\Upsilon^{-1}(\triangle_M))\big] = [\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m};\omega,\mu,J,A)_S].\tag{5.22}$$

Then by Theorem 5.3, (5.22) and (5.21) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\
&=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m,S}(\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\
&=\langle PD_S(\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2)),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)_S]\rangle\\
&=\langle PD(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m,\omega,\mu,J,A;\Upsilon^{-1}(\triangle_M))]\rangle\\
&=\langle PD(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M),\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]\rangle.
\end{aligned}\tag{5.23}$$

Note that the restriction of $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ to each open stratified Banach orbifold

$$\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1^{(s)},g_1,m_1+1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2^{(s)},g_2,m_2+1}\subset\bigcup_{t=1}^l\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1^{(t)},g_1,m_1+1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2^{(t)},g_2,m_2+1}$$

gives a virtual moduli chain $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)_s$ of dimension $2(m+2)+2c_1(A)+2(3-n)(g-2)$ associated with

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1+1}(M,J,A_1^{(s)};K_4)\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2+1}(M,J,A_2^{(s)};K_4).$$

Indeed, let

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{W}^*_s:=\mathcal{W}^*\cap(\mathcal{B}^M_{A_1^{(s)},g_1,m_1+1}\times\mathcal{B}^M_{A_2^{(s)},g_2,m_2+1}),\\
&\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_s:=(\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}(\mathcal{W}^*_s)\cap\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)
\end{aligned}$$

and $\hat{\pi}_I^s$ denote the restriction of $\hat{\pi}_I$ to $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_s$. Then we may take

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)_s=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}_l}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I^s:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_s\to\mathcal{W}^*_s\}.$$

In constructing rational cycle of (5.19), if we replace $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ by $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)_s$ then we get a rational cycle in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_1,m_1}\times\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g_2,m_2}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\{\bar{\alpha}_j\}_{j=m_1+1}^m;A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})$$

as in (5.15). Note that $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)_s$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)_j$ might have nonempty intersection for $s\neq j$. However their top strata are disjoint each other, i.e.,

$$T\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)_s\cap T\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)_j=\emptyset,\ s\neq j,\ s,j=1,\cdots,l;$$

other strata have at least codimension two. It is easily seen that these conclusions also hold for $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\bar{\alpha}_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\{\bar{\alpha}_j\}_{j=m_1+1}^m;A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})$, $s=1,\cdots,q$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M),\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A).\big]\\
&=\sum_{s=1}^q\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\{\alpha_j\}_{j=m_1+1}^m;A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})\big].
\end{aligned}$$

This and (5.23) give

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &=\sum_{s=1}^{q}\big\langle PD(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2),\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\{\alpha_j\}_{j=m_1+1}^{m};A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})\big]\big\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{5.24}$$

By Lemma 5.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\big[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},PD^{II}(\triangle_M);\{\alpha_j\}_{j=m_1+1}^{m};A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})\big]\\ &=\sum_{i,j}c_{ij}[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m_1},\beta_i\otimes\beta_j,\{\alpha_i\}_{i=m_1+1}^{m};A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})]\\ &=\sum_{i,j}c_{ij}[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;(\otimes_{i=1}^{m_1}\alpha_i)\otimes\beta_i,\beta_j\otimes(\otimes_{i=m_1+1}^{m}\alpha_i);A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})].\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the definition in (5.17),

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{\{A_i^{(s)},g_i,m_i\}}(\kappa_1,\kappa_2;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m_1},\beta_i;\beta_j,\alpha_{m_1+1},\cdots,\alpha_m)$$

is equal to

$$(-1)^{\dim\kappa_1\dim\kappa_2}\langle PD(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2),[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_{(g_1,g_2)}(K_0;(\otimes_{i=1}^{m_1}\alpha_i)\otimes\beta_i,\beta_j\otimes(\otimes_{i=m_1+1}^{m}\alpha_i);A_1^{(s)},A_2^{(s)})]\rangle.$$

From (5.24) and Lemma 5 It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\varphi_{Q*}(\kappa_1\times\kappa_2);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &=(-1)^{\epsilon}\sum_{s=1}^{q}\sum_{i,j}c_{ij}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{\{A_i^{(s)},g_i,m_i\}}(\kappa_1,\kappa_2;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m_1},\beta_i;\beta_j,\alpha_{m_1+1},\cdots,\alpha_m)\\ &=(-1)^{\epsilon}\sum_{s=1}^{q}\sum_{i,j}c_{ij}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_1^{(s)},g_1,m_1}(\kappa_1;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m_1},\beta_i)\cdot\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A_2^{(s)},g_2,m_2}(\kappa_2;\beta_j,\alpha_{m_1+1},\cdots,\alpha_m).\end{aligned}$$

Here $\epsilon=\dim\kappa_1\dim\kappa_2$. Note that the dimension condition (1.5) implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m_1}\deg\alpha_i+\deg\kappa_1\in 2\mathbb{Z}\quad\text{and}\quad\sum_{i=m_1+1}^{m}\deg\alpha_i+\kappa_2\in 2\mathbb{Z}.$$

We get

$$(-1)^{\epsilon}=(-1)^{\dim\kappa_1\dim\kappa_2}=(-1)^{\deg\kappa_1\deg\kappa_2}=(-1)^{\deg\kappa_2\sum_{i=1}^{m_1}\alpha_i}$$

because $\dim\kappa_j+\deg\kappa_j\in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for $j=1,2$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.7. □

5.3 Reduction formulas

Suppose that $2g+m\ge 3$ and $(g,m)\ne(0,3),(1,1)$. For a m-pointed stable curve $(\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}')$ of genus g one may obtain a $(m-1)$-pointed stable curve $(\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}})$ of genus g by forgetting the last marked point and contracting the unstable rational component. This yields a forgetful map $\mathcal{F}_m:\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}\to\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}$, $[\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]\mapsto[\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}']$. It is a Lefschetz fibration, whose fibre at $[\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]$ may be identified with the quotient $\Sigma/\mathrm{Aut}(\Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$. But one can still define the integration along the fibre for it. That is, we have a map

$$(\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp : \Omega^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}) \to \Omega^{*-2}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}) \tag{5.25}$$

that commutes with exterior differentiation d and that satisfies the projection formula:

(a) $(\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp((\mathcal{F}_m^*\tau) \wedge \omega) = \tau \wedge (\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp(\omega)\ \forall \tau \in \Omega^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1})$ and $\omega \in \Omega^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m})$;

(b) $\int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}}(\mathcal{F}_m^*\tau)\wedge\omega = \int_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}}\tau\wedge(\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp(\omega)$ for any $\omega \in \Omega^q(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m})$ and $\tau \in \Omega^{6g-6+2m-q}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1})$, where the integrations are over the orbifolds. We still denote by $(\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp :\ H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}, \mathbb{Q}) \to H^{*-2}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}, \mathbb{Q})$ the induced map. $\mathcal{F}_m$ also induces a "shriek" map

$$(\mathcal{F}_m)_! : H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}; \mathbb{Q}) \to H_{*+2}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}; \mathbb{Q}) \tag{5.26}$$

given by $\kappa \mapsto PD_m^{-1}\circ\mathcal{F}_m^*\circ PD_{m-1}(\kappa)$, where $PD_m : H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}; \mathbb{Q}) \to H^{6g-6+2m-*}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}; \mathbb{Q})$ is the Poincaré duality.

Clearly, from (5.26) and (b) we get

$$\mathcal{F}_m^* \circ PD_{m-1}(\kappa) = PD_m((\mathcal{F}_m)_!(\kappa)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp \circ PD_m = PD_{m-1} \circ (\mathcal{F}_m)_* \tag{5.27}$$

respectively. So for any $\alpha \in H^*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}; \mathbb{Q})$ and $[c] \in H_{*-2}(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}; \mathbb{Q})$ we have

$$\langle(\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp(\alpha), [c]\rangle_{m-1} = \langle\alpha, (\mathcal{F}_m)_!([c])\rangle_m. \tag{5.28}$$

The reduction formulas are the following two theorems.

Theorem 5.8. *If $(g, m) \neq (0, 3), (1, 1)$, then for any $\kappa \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}; \mathbb{Q})$, $\alpha_1 \in H^*_c(M; \mathbb{Q})$, $\alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_m \in H^*(M; \mathbb{Q})$ with $\deg \alpha_m = 2$ it holds that*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}((\mathcal{F}_m)_!(\kappa); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_m) = \alpha_m(A) \cdot \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m-1}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{m-1}).$$

Theorem 5.9. *If $(g, m) \neq (0, 3), (1, 1)$, $\kappa \in H_*(\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}; \mathbb{Q})$ and $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{m-1}$ are as in Theorem 5.8 then it also holds that*

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa; \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{m-1}, \mathbf{1}) = \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m-1}((\mathcal{F}_m)_*(\kappa); \alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_{m-1}).$$

Here $\mathbf{1} \in H^0(M, \mathbb{Q})$ is the identity.

In order to prove these two theorems we need a similar map to $\mathcal{F}_m$. A stable L^p_k-map $(f; \Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}})$ is called *strong* if for each component Σ_s of Σ satisfying $(f \circ \pi_{\Sigma_s})_*([\widetilde{\Sigma}_s]) = 0 \in H_2(M, \mathbb{Z})$ we have: (i) $m_s + 2g_s \geq 3$, and (ii) $f|_{\Sigma_s}$ is constant. Correspondingly we call the isomorphism class $[f; \Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}] \in \mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ strong. Let us denote by

$$(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_s \quad (\text{resp.}(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_0)$$

the subset consisting of the strong stable $[f; \Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}] \in \mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ (resp., the stable $[f; \Sigma, \bar{\mathbf{z}}] \in \mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ which is still stable after removing the last marked point.) Then $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M, A, J) \subset (\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_s$, and $(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_0$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$. Carefully checking the proof of Lemma 23.2 of [FuO] it is also not hard to see that the domain Σ of each element $[f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]\in\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}\setminus(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_0$ has at least two components. Thus $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}\setminus(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_0$ has at least codimension two in $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$. The proof of Lemma 23.2 of [FuO] implies the following result.

Lemma 5.10 *Let $2g+m\ge 3$, if $(g,m)\ne(0,3),(1,1)$ or $A\ne 0$ then the obvious map $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m:(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_0\to\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m-1}$ forgetting the last marked point is surjective and may be extended to a map*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m:(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_{s0}:=(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_s\cup(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_0\to\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m-1}$$

satisfying

$$\Pi_{g,m-1}\circ\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m=\mathcal{F}_m\circ(\Pi_{g,m}|_{(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_{s0}}).\tag{5.29}$$

Moreover, the map may be regarded as a universal family, i.e., the fibre

$$(\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m)^{-1}([\mathbf{f}])=\Sigma/\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbf{f}),\ \forall\,[\mathbf{f}]=[f,\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]\in\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m-1}.$$

Indeed, if $[f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]\in(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_s\setminus(\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_0$ and Σ_0 is the component of Σ containing the m-th marked point z_m then $[f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}]\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J)$ will become unstable after removing z_m. As in [FuO], $f|_{\Sigma_0}$ has the homology class zero in $H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$ and the genus g_0 of Σ_0 is zero. Consequently either Σ_0 has one singular point and one marked point z_k with $k\ne m$ or Σ_0 has two singular points and unique marked point z_m. In the first case one removes Σ_0 from Σ and replaces z_k with the point where Σ_0 was attached. In the second case one removes Σ_0 from Σ and glues it at the two points where Σ_0 was attached. For each case one can get a stable curve $[\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}']$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$, and f naturally induces a map f' on Σ' such that $(f';\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}')$ is a stable L^p_k-map. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m([f;\Sigma,\bar{\mathbf{z}}])$ is defined as $[f';\Sigma',\bar{\mathbf{z}}']$. One easily sees that it satisfies Lemma 5.10. Note here it is very key that f is *constant* on Σ_0. In general we do not know whether or not the map $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m$ may be extended to the space $\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$. For the proof of another claim the reader may refer to the arguments below the proof of Lemma 23.2 of [FuO]. In particular, the restriction to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J)$ of the map $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m$ may be regarded as a universal family.

To avoid excessive transversality arguments we shall use the equivalent definition (4.14) in the proofs of the following two theorems.

Proof of Theorem 5.8. Fix a compact subset $K_0\subset M$ containing $\mathrm{supp}(\wedge_{i=1}^m\alpha_i)$. As before we take $[\mathbf{f}_i]\in\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J;K_3)$ and sections $\tilde{s}_{ij}:\widetilde{W}_i\to\widetilde{E}_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n_3$ and $j=1,\cdots,q_i$ to construct a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0):=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\{\hat{\pi}_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)\to\mathcal{W}^*\}\quad\forall\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$$

of dimension $2m+2c_1(M)(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)$ in $\mathcal{W}^*=\cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}}V^*_I\subset\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}(M,A,J;K_3)$. Here $q=q_1+\cdots+q_{n_3}$.

Denote by $\mathbf{f}'_i=\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m(\mathbf{f}_i)$ and $[\mathbf{f}'_i]=\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m([\mathbf{f}_i])$, $i=1,\cdots,n_3$. As above we take sections $\tilde{s}'_{ij}:\widetilde{W}'_i\to\widetilde{E}'_i$, $i=1,\cdots,n_3$ and $j=1,\cdots,q_i$ to construct a family of cobordant virtual moduli chains

$$\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)':=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\{\hat{\pi}'_I:\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)'\to\mathcal{W}\prime*\}\quad\forall\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)\tag{5.30}$$

of dimension $2(m-1)+2c_1(M)(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)$ in $\mathcal{W}'^* = \cup_{I\in\mathcal{N}} V_I'^* \subset \mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m-1}$ associated with $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m-1}(M,A,J;K_3)$. This is possible by increasing n_3 if necessary.

We now show that the sections $\tilde{s}_{ij}$ and $\tilde{s}'_{ij}$ can be suitably chosen so that $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}(K_0)'$ may be related. Note that $\tilde{s}'_{ij} = \beta'_i\cdot\tilde{\nu}'_{ij}$ and that ν'_{ij} has the support disjoint from marked or singular points on domain Σ' of $\mathbf{f}'_i$. So ν'_{ij} may be naturally regarded as an element of $L^p_{k-1}(\wedge^{0,1}(f^*TM))$, $\nu_{ij} = \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m^*\nu'_{ij}$. For given $\widetilde{W}'_i$ we construct a Γ_i-invariant $\widetilde{W}_i$ such that

$$\widetilde{W}_i^{s0} := \pi_i^{-1}((\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_{s0}) \cap \widetilde{W}_i = \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m^{-1}(\widetilde{W}'_i) \tag{5.31}$$

for the projection $\pi_i : \widetilde{W}_i \to W_i \subset \mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m}$. Then $\widetilde{E}_i^{s0} := \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m^*\widetilde{E}'_i$ is equal to the restriction of the bundle $\widetilde{E}_i$ to $\widetilde{W}_i^{s0}$. We may take a Γ_i-invariant cut-off function β_i on $\widetilde{W}_i^{s0}$ such that $\beta_i = \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m^*\beta'_i$ on $\widetilde{W}_i^{s0}$. Set $\tilde{s}_{ij} = \beta_i\cdot\tilde{\nu}_{ij}$ then the virtual moduli chains in (5.28) and (5.29) satisfy: For each $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{B}^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathbb{R}^q)$ the set

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0} := \mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0) \cap (\hat{\pi}_I)^{-1}((\mathcal{B}^M_{A,g,m})_{s0})$$

has a complementary of at least codimension two in $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)$, and

$$\Pi := \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m|_{\hat{\pi}_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})} : \hat{\pi}_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0}) \to \hat{\pi}'_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)') \tag{5.32}$$

is also a Lefschetz fibration. So it follows from (4.14) and (5.27) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}((\mathcal{F}_m)_!(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m) \qquad (5.33)\\
&= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)}(\Pi_{g,m}\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*(\mathcal{F}_m^*\kappa^*)\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0}}(\Pi_{g,m}\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*(\mathcal{F}_m^*\kappa^*)\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i\circ\hat{\pi}_I)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0}}\hat{\pi}_I^*\Big((\mathcal{F}_m\circ\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\Big)\\
&= \sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\int_{\hat{\pi}_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})}(\mathcal{F}_m\circ\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last equality comes from the definition of the integration over the orbifold $\hat{\pi}_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0}) = \mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0}/\Gamma_I$.

Note that $\mathrm{ev}_i = \mathrm{ev}'_i\circ\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m$, $1\le i\le m-1$. By (5.29) and the projection formula we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\hat{\pi}_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})}(\mathcal{F}_m\circ\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big) \qquad (5.34)\\
&= \int_{\hat{\pi}_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})}(\Pi_{g,m-1}\circ\Pi)^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i\circ\Pi)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\wedge\mathrm{ev}_m^*\alpha_m^*\\
&= \int_{\hat{\pi}_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})}\Pi^*\Big((\Pi_{g,m-1})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\Big)\wedge\mathrm{ev}_m^*\alpha_m^*\\
&= \int_{\hat{\pi}'_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)')}(\Pi_{g,m-1})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\wedge\Pi_\sharp(\mathrm{ev}_m^*\alpha_m^*)\\
&= \alpha_m(A)\int_{\hat{\pi}'_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{t}}_I(K_0)')}(\Pi_{g,m-1})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the third equality comes from (5.32), and the last step uses the fact that $\Pi_\sharp(\mathrm{ev}_m^*\alpha_m^*) = (\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_m)_\sharp(\mathrm{ev}_m^*\alpha_m^*) = \alpha_m(A)$. Now (5.33) and (5.34) yield

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}((\mathcal{F}_m)_!(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\int_{\hat\pi_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})}(\mathcal{F}_m\circ\Pi^A_{g,m})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\alpha_m(A)\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\int_{\hat\pi'_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)')}(\Pi^A_{g,m-1})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\alpha_m(A)\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)'}(\Pi^A_{g,m-1}\circ\hat\pi'_I)^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i\circ\hat\pi'_I)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\alpha_m(A)\cdot\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m-1}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m).
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 5.8 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 5.9. Note that (5.29) implies $\Pi_\sharp\circ(\Pi_{g,m})^* = (\Pi_{g,m-1})^*\circ(\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.8 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa;\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1},\mathbf{1})\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0}}(\Pi_{g,m}\circ\hat\pi_I)^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i\circ\hat\pi_I)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0}}\hat\pi_I^*\Big((\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\Big)\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\int_{\hat\pi_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})}(\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{ev}_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\int_{\hat\pi_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)_{s0})}(\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i\circ\Pi)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\wedge\mathrm{ev}_m^*1\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\int_{\hat\pi'_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)')}\Pi_\sharp((\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*)\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\int_{\hat\pi'_I(\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)')}(\Pi_{g,m-1})^*((\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp\kappa^*)\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\sum_{I\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{|\Gamma'_I|}\int_{\mathcal{M}^{\mathfrak{t}}_I(K_0)'}(\Pi_{g,m-1}\circ\hat\pi'_I)^*((\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp\kappa^*)\wedge\big(\wedge_{i=1}^{m-1}(\mathrm{ev}'_i\circ\hat\pi'_I)^*\alpha_i^*\big)\\
&=\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m-1}((\mathcal{F}_m)_*(\kappa);\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_{m-1}),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the sixth equality is because $\Pi_\sharp((\Pi_{g,m})^*\kappa^*) = (\Pi_{g,m-1})^*((\mathcal{F}_m)_\sharp\kappa^*)$. □

Using (5.27) and (5.28) it easily follows that the reduction formulas in Theorems 5.8 and 5.9 can be written as the following versions

$$
(\mathcal{F}_m)_*([\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^m;\omega,\mu,J,A)]) = \alpha_m(A)\cdot[\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}'}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m-1};\omega,\mu,J,A)], \tag{5.35}
$$

$$
(\mathcal{F}_m)_!([\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}'}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m-1};\omega,\mu,J,A)]) = [\mathcal{C}^{\mathbf{t}}_g(K_0;\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m-1},\mathbf{1};\omega,\mu,J,A)] \tag{5.36}
$$

respectively.

6 Quantum Cohomology, WDVV Equation and String Equation

In this section we shall apply the invariants constructed in the previous sections to the constructions of quantum cohomology, solutions of WDVV equation and Witten's string equation. We only give main points because they are imitation for the arguments in [McSa1, RT1, RT2, T1, W1, W2, CoKa] etc.

6.1 Generalized string equation and dilation equation

Let $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{g,m}$ be the universal curve over $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$. The i-th marked point z_i yields a section $\tilde{z}_i$ of the fibration $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{g,m} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{g,m}$. Denote by $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{M}}$ the cotangent bundle to fibers of this fibration, and by $\mathcal{L}_i = \tilde{z}_i(\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{U}|\mathcal{M}})$. For nonnegative integers $d_1, \cdots, d_m$ we also denote by $\kappa_{d_1,\cdots,d_m}$ the Poincaré dual of $c_1(\mathcal{L}_1)^{d_1} \cup \cdots \cup c_1(\mathcal{L}_m)^{d_m}$.

Now we need to define (or make conventions)

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa_{d_1,\cdots,d_m}; \underbrace{\mathbf{1},\cdots,\mathbf{1}}_{m\,\text{times}}) = 0 \\ \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,3}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}]; \mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) = 0 \\ \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,1,1}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{1,1}]; \mathbf{1}) = 0 \\ \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{0,1,1}(\kappa_1; \mathbf{1}) = 0 \\ \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{0,1,1}([pt]; \mathbf{1}) = \chi(M) \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

because these cannot be included in the category of our definition. Here $\chi(M)$ is the Euler characteristic of M. These definitions or conventions are determined by the conclusions in the case that M is a closed symplectic manifold.

Since M is noncompact, $H^0_c(M,\mathbb{Q}) = 0$. So the cohomology ring $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ has no the unit element. But $H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ has a unit element $\mathbf{1} \in H^0(M,\mathbb{Q})$, which is Poincaré dual to the fundamental class $[M] \in H^{\mathrm{II}}_{2n}(M,\mathbb{Q})$. Let us define

$$\widetilde{H}^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q}) = H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q}) \oplus \mathbf{1}\mathbb{Q} \tag{6.2}$$

so that $\widetilde{H}^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ becomes a ring with the unit. Note that $H^i_c(M,\mathbb{R})$ for every i is at most countably generated. There exist at most countable linearly independent elements $\{\gamma_i\}_{2\le i<N}$ in $H^{\mathrm{even}}_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ such that $H^{\mathrm{even}}_c(M,\mathbb{Q}) = \mathrm{span}(\{\gamma_i\}_{2\le i<N})$. Here N is a natural number or $+\infty$. Set $\gamma_1 = \mathbf{1}$. We get that $\mathrm{span}(\{\gamma_i\}_{1\le i<N}) = \widetilde{H}^{\mathrm{even}}_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$. For $1 \le a, b < N$ let

$$\zeta_{ab} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \deg\gamma_a + \deg\gamma_b \neq 2n, \\ \int_M \gamma_a^* \wedge \gamma_b^* & \text{if } \deg\gamma_a + \deg\gamma_b = 2n. \end{cases} \tag{6.3}$$

Then by the second conclusion of Theorem 4.2 we have

$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,3}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3}]; \mathbf{1}, \gamma_a, \gamma_b) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A \neq 0 \\ \zeta_{ab} & \text{if } A = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.4}$$

Given an integer $g \ge 0$ and $A \in H_2(M)$, let one class in $\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le m} \subset H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q}) \cup H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ belong to $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$. We call the invariant

$$\langle \tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g,A} = \mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa_{d_1,\cdots,d_m}; \alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m) \tag{6.5}$$

a *gravitational correlator*. The m-point genus-g correlators are defined by

$$\langle \tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_g(q)=\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m}(\kappa_{d_1,\cdots,d_m};\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)q^A. \tag{6.6}$$

where q is an element of Novikov ring as before.

With the given base $\{\gamma_i\}_{1\le i<N}$ above and formal variables t^a_r, $1\le a<N$, $r=0,1,2,\cdots$, all genus-g correlators can be assembled into a generating function, called *free energy function*([W2]), as follows:

$$F^M_g(t^a_r;q)=\sum_{n_{r,a}}\prod_{r,a}\frac{(t^a_r)^{n_{r,a}}}{n_{r,a}!}\Big\langle\prod_{r,a}\tau^{n_{r,a}}_{r,\gamma_a}\Big\rangle_g(q), \tag{6.7}$$

where $n_{r,a}$ are arbitrary collections of nonnegative integers, almost all zero, labelled by r,a. Witten's generating function ([W2]) is the infinite sum

$$F^M(t^a_r;q)=\sum_{g\ge 0}\lambda^{2g-2}F^M_g(t^a_r;q), \tag{6.8}$$

where λ is the genus expansion parameter. As in [W2] (referring to the proofs of Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 in [RT2] for details) one can easily derive from Theorem 5.9, (6.1) and (6.4) the following equations:

$$\Big\langle\tau_{0,\gamma_1}\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i,\gamma_{a_i}}\Big\rangle_g(q)=\sum_{j=1}^m\Big\langle\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i-\delta_{i,j},\gamma_{a_i}}\Big\rangle_g(q)+\delta_{m,2}\delta_{d_1,0}\delta_{d_2,0}\zeta_{a_1,a_2}, \tag{6.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle\tau_{1,\gamma_1}\textstyle\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i,\gamma_{a_i}}\big\rangle_g(q)=(2g-2-m)\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^m\big\langle\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i,\gamma_{a_i}}\big\rangle_g(q)\\ +\tfrac{1}{24}\chi(M)\delta_{g,1}\delta_{m,0}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

Here the integers $g\ge 0$, $m>0$ with $2g+m\ge 2$, $d_1,\cdots,d_m$ are nonnegative integers, and $\tau_{r,\alpha}=0$ if $r<0$. As in [W2, RT2] it immediately follows from (6.9) and (6.10) that

Theorem 6.1. *The above functions $F^M(t^a_r;q)$ and $F^M_g(t^a_r;q)$ satisfy respectively the following the generalized string equation and the dilation equation:*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial F^M}{\partial t^1_0}&=\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{ab}t^a_0t^b_0+\sum_{i=0}^\infty\sum_a t^a_{i+1}\frac{\partial F^M}{\partial t^a_i},\\ \frac{\partial F^M_g}{\partial t^1_1}&=\Big(2g-2+\sum_{i=1}^\infty\sum_a t^a_i\frac{\partial}{\partial t^a_i}\Big)F^M_g+\frac{\chi(M)}{24}\delta_{g,1}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $c_1(M)=0$, F^M also satisfies the dilation equation

$$\frac{\partial F^M}{\partial t^1_1}=\sum_{i=1}^\infty\sum_a\Big(\frac{2}{3-n}\Big(i-1+\frac{1}{2}\deg\gamma_a\Big)+1\Big)t^a_i\frac{\partial F^M}{\partial t^a_i}+\frac{\chi(M)}{24}.$$

We may also make a bit generalization. Given a collection of nonzero homogeneous elements $\underline{\xi}=\{\xi_i\}_{1\le i\le l}$ in $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{C})\cup H^*(M,\mathbb{C})$ we replace (6.6) by

$$\langle\underline{\xi}|\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_g(q)=\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m+l}(\kappa_{d_1,\cdots,d_m};\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m,\underline{\xi})q^A \tag{6.11}$$

and make the following
Convention: $\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,m+2}(\kappa;\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_m)=0$ for any $m\ge 0$ whether or not this case may be included in our definition category. (This is reasonable if it may be defined.)

Then the same reason as in (6.9) and (6.10) gives rise to

$$\langle\underline{\xi}|\tau_{0,\gamma_1}\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i,\gamma_{a_i}}\rangle_g(q)=\sum_{j=1}^m\langle\underline{\xi}|\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i-\delta_{i,j},\gamma_{a_i}}\rangle_g(q), \tag{6.12}$$

$$\langle\underline{\xi}|\tau_{1,\gamma_1}\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i,\gamma_{a_i}}\rangle_g(q)=(2g-2-m)\sum_{j=1}^m\langle\underline{\xi}|\prod_{i=1}^m\tau_{d_i,\gamma_{a_i}}\rangle_g(q). \tag{6.13}$$

It follows from them that

Theorem 6.2. *The variants of (6.7) and (6.8),*

$$F^M_g(\underline{\xi}|t^a_r;q)=\textstyle\sum_{n_{r,a}}\prod_{r,a}\frac{(t^a_r)^{n_{r,a}}}{n_{r,a}!}\langle\underline{\xi}|\prod_{r,a}\tau^{n_{r,a}}_{r,\gamma_a}\rangle_g(q), \tag{6.14}$$

$$F^M(\underline{\xi}|t^a_r;q)=\textstyle\sum_{g\ge 0}\lambda^{2g-2}F^M_g(\underline{\xi}|t^a_r;q), \tag{6.15}$$

still called Witten's generating function, respectively satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial F^M(\underline{\xi}|\cdot)}{\partial t^1_0}&=\sum_{i=0}^\infty\sum_a t^a_{i+1}\frac{\partial F^M(\underline{\xi}|\cdot)}{\partial t^a_i},\\ \frac{\partial F^M_g(\underline{\xi}|\cdot)}{\partial t^1_1}&=\Bigl(2g-2+\sum_{i=1}^\infty\sum_a t^a_i\frac{\partial}{\partial t^a_i}\Bigr)F^M_g(\underline{\xi}|\cdot).\end{aligned}$$

They are still called the generalized string equation and the dilation equation. Moreover, if $c_1(M)=0$, $F^M(\underline{\xi}|\cdot)$ also satisfies the dilation equation

$$\frac{\partial F^M(\underline{\xi}|\cdot)}{\partial t^1_1}=\sum_{i=1}^\infty\sum_a\Bigl(\frac{2}{3-n}\Bigl(i-1+\frac{1}{2}\deg\gamma_a\Bigr)+1\Bigr)t^a_i\frac{\partial F^M(\underline{\xi}|\cdot)}{\partial t^a_i}.$$

It follows from the properties of Gromov-Witten invariants in §5 that the gravitational correlators defined in (6.5) have the following properties(cf. [CoKa]).

Degree Axiom. The gravitational correlator $\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g,A}$ can be nonzero only if

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^m(2d_i+\deg\alpha_i)=2c_1(M)(A)+2(3-n)(g-1)+2m.$$

Fundamental Class Axiom. Define $\tau_{-1,\alpha}=0$, then

$$\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_{m-1},\alpha_{m-1}}\tau_{0,\mathbf{1}}\rangle_{g,A}=\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}\langle\prod_{i=1}^{m-1}\tau_{d_i-\delta_{i,j},\alpha_i}\rangle_{g,A}.$$

Divisor Axiom. Assume that $m+2g\ge 4$ or $A\ne 0$ and $m\ge 1$. Then for $\alpha_i\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$, $i=1,\cdots,m$ and $\deg\alpha_m=2$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{0,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g,A}&=\alpha_m(A)\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_{m-1},\alpha_{m-1}}\rangle_{g,A}\\ &+\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\cdots\tau_{d_{j-1},\alpha_{j-1}}\tau_{d_{j-1},\alpha_{j-1}\cup\alpha_m}\tau_{d_{j+1},\alpha_{j+1}}\cdots\tau_{d_{m-1},\alpha_{m-1}}\rangle_{g,A}.\end{aligned}$$

Dilation Axiom. If $2g+m\ge 3$ then

$$\langle\tau_{1,\mathbf{1}}\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g,A}=(2g-2+m)\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g,A}.$$

Splitting Axiom. If $\dim H^*(M)<+\infty$ and $\alpha_1,\alpha_m\in H^*_c(M,\mathbb{Q})$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g,A}&=\sum_{i,j}\sum_{A_1+A_2=A}\eta^{ij}\\ &\langle\tau_{d_1,\alpha_1}\tau_{d_2,\alpha_2}\cdots\tau_{d_{m_1},\alpha_{m_1}}\tau_{0,\beta_i}\rangle_{g_1,A_1}\langle\tau_{0,\beta_j}\tau_{d_{m_1+1},\alpha_{m_1+1}}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\alpha_m}\rangle_{g_2,A_2}.\end{aligned}$$

where g_k, m_k, $k=1,2$, $\{\beta_i\}$ and η^{ij} are as in Theorem 5.7.

6.2 The WDVV equation

In this subsection we assume that

$$\dim H^*(M)<\infty. \tag{6.16}$$

Let $\{\beta_i\}_{1\le i\le L}$ be a basis of $H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ consisting of homogeneous elements as in Theorem 5.7. We may assume them to satisfy that $\deg\beta_i$ is even if and only if $i\le N$. Let $\underline{\alpha}=\{\alpha_i\}_{1\le i\le k}$ be a collection of nonzero homogeneous elements in $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{C})\cup H^*(M,\mathbb{C})$ and at least one of them belongs to $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{C})$. Putting $w=\sum t_i\beta_i\in H^*(M,\mathbb{C})$ we define *$\underline{\alpha}$-Gromov-Witten potential* by a formal power series in q,

$$\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}(w)=\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{m\ge\max(1,3-k)}\frac{1}{m!}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,k+m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k+m}];\underline{\alpha},w,\cdots,w)q^A. \tag{6.17}$$

To avoid additional technicalities in using superstructures we only consider the case $w=\sum_{i=1}^N t_i\beta_i\in W=H^{\rm even}(M,\mathbb{C})$. Taking the third derivative on both sides of

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{(q,\overline{\alpha})}(w)=&\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{m\ge\max(1,3-k)}\sum_{1\le i_1,\cdots,i_m\le N}\frac{1}{m!}\\ &\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,k+m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k+m}];\overline{\alpha},\beta_{i_1},\cdots,\beta_{i_m})t_{i_1}\cdots t_{i_m}q^A,\end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Phi_{(q,\overline{\alpha})}(w)}{\partial t_i\partial t_j\partial t_a}=&\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\sum_{1\le i_1,\cdots,i_m\le N}\frac{1}{m!}\\ &\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,k+3+m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k+3+m}];\underline{\alpha},\beta_i,\beta_j,\beta_a,\beta_{i_1},\cdots,\beta_{i_m})t_{i_1}\cdots t_{i_m}q^A.\end{aligned}$$

It immediately follows from this and Theorem 5.7 that

Theorem 6.3. *For any specified number q the function $\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}$ satisfies* **WDVV***-equation of the following form*

$$\sum_{r,s}\frac{\partial^3\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}}{\partial t_i\partial t_j\partial t_r}\eta^{rs}\frac{\partial^3\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}}{\partial t_k\partial t_l\partial t_s}=\sum_{r,s}\frac{\partial^3\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}}{\partial t_i\partial t_k\partial t_r}\eta^{rs}\frac{\partial^3\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}}{\partial t_j\partial t_l\partial t_s} \tag{6.19}$$

for $1\le i,j,k,l\le N$, where $\eta^{rs}=\int_M\omega_r\wedge\omega_s$ as in Theorem 5.7.

By the statement below Theorem 5.7, $\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}$ satisfies the ordinary WDVV equation if M is a closed symplectic manifold.

Remark 6.4. The idea to prove (6.19) is that using Theorem 5.7 and the direct computation show that both sides of (6.19) are equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\sum_{m=0}^{n}\sum_{1\le j_1,\cdots,j_m\le N}\frac{1}{m!(n-m)!}\\ &\qquad\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,2k+4+m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,2k+4+m}];\underline{\alpha},\underline{\alpha},\beta_i,\beta_j,\beta_k,\beta_l,\beta_{j_1},\cdots,\beta_{j_m})t_{i_1}\cdots t_{i_m}q^A.\end{aligned}$$

By the skew symmetry of Gromov-Witten invariants it is zero if some element of $\underline{\alpha}$ has odd degree. Therefore (6.17) is interesting only if $\underline{\alpha}$ consists of cohomology classes of even degree. Later we shall always assume this case without special statements. Clearly, (6.17) gives rise to a family of new solutions of the WDVV equation even if M is a closed symplectic manifold. The reasons to introduce $\underline{\alpha}$-Gromov-Witten potential are that on one hand we need to require $w\in H^*(M,\mathbb{C})$ because of the composition laws and on the other hand the definition category of our Gromov-Witten invariants requires that at least one cohomology class belongs to $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{C})$. Moreover, if we assume $\beta_1=\mathbf{1}$ it follows from Theorem 4.2 that all terms containing t_1 at the right side of (6.19) are all zero.

Following [RT1] we define a family of connections on the tangent bundle TW over W as follows:

$$\nabla^{\epsilon}v=\sum_{i,j}\Big(\frac{\partial v^i}{\partial t_j}+\epsilon\sum_{k,l}\eta^{il}\frac{\partial^3\Phi_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}}{\partial t_l\partial t_j\partial t_k}v^k\Big)\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i}\otimes dt_j \tag{6.20}$$

for a tangent vector field $v=\sum_i v^i\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i}$ in TW, where η^{il} is as in Theorem 6.3. It is easily checked that $\nabla^{\epsilon}\circ\nabla^{\epsilon}=0$ is equivalent to the above WDVV equation (6.20). Therefore we have

Theorem 6.5. *$\{\nabla^{\epsilon}\}$ is a family of the flat connections on the tangent bundle TW.*

More generally, let $\{\xi_i\}_{1\le i\le m}\subset H^*(M,\mathbb{C})\cup H^*_c(M,\mathbb{C})$ and at least one of them belong to $H^*_c(M,\mathbb{C})$. For nonnegative integers $d_1,\cdots,d_m$ and for $w=\sum_{i=1}^N t_i\beta_i\in W=H^{\rm even}(M,\mathbb{C})$ we may define *$\underline{\alpha}$-genus g couplings*

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\langle\tau_{d_1,\xi_1}\cdots\tau_{d_m,\xi_m};w\rangle\rangle_{g,\underline{\alpha}}=&\textstyle\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{m\ge\max(1,3-2g-k)}\frac{1}{m!}\\ &\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,k+m}(\kappa_{d_1,\cdots,d_m};\underline{\alpha},w,\cdots,w)q^A\end{aligned}\tag{6.21}$$

and *$\underline{\alpha}$-genus g gravitational Gromov-Witten potential*

$$\Phi^{g,\{d_i\}}_{(q,\underline{\alpha})}(w)=\textstyle\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{m\ge\max(1,3-2g-k)}\frac{1}{m!}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,g,k+m}(\kappa_{d_1,\cdots,d_m};\underline{\alpha},w,\cdots,w)q^A,\tag{6.22}$$

and study their properties. We omit them.

6.3 Quantum cohomology

We still assume that (6.16) holds. Let $H_2(M)$ be the free part of $H_2(M,\mathbb{Z})$. So far it has a finite integral basis $A_1,\cdots,A_d$. Thus every $A\in H_2(M)$ may be written as $A=r_1A_1+\cdots+r_dA_d$ for unique $(r_1,\cdots,r_d)\in\mathbb{Z}^d$. Denote by $q_j=e^{2\pi iA_j}$, $j=1,\cdots,d$, and by $q^A=q_1^{r_1}\cdots q_d^{r_d}$. Following [HS1, RT1, McSa1] an element of the Novikov ring $\Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{Q})$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ is the formal sum

$$\lambda=\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\lambda_A q^A,$$

where the coefficients $\lambda_A\in\mathbb{Q}$ are subject to the finiteness condition $\sharp\{A\in H_2(M)\,|\,\lambda_A\neq 0,\ \omega(A)\le c\}<\infty$ for any $c>0$. The multiplication in this ring is defined by $\lambda*\mu=\sum_{A,B}\lambda_A\mu_B q^{A+B}$. It has a natural grading given by $\deg q^A=2c_1(A)$. Denote by $QH^*(M,\mathbb{Q})=H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})\otimes\Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{Q})$.

Let $\{\beta_i\}_{1\le i\le L}$ and $\underline{\alpha}$ be as in §6.2. For $\alpha,\beta\in H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ we define an element of $QH^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$ by

$$\alpha\star_{\underline{\alpha}}\beta=\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{i,j}\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,3+k}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3+k}];\underline{\alpha},\alpha,\beta,\beta_i)\eta^{ij}\beta_j q^A. \tag{6.23}$$

More generally, for a given $w=\sum_{i=1}^L t_i\beta_i\in H^*(M,\mathbb{C})$ we also define another element of $QH^*(M,\mathbb{C})=H^*(M,\mathbb{C})\otimes\Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{C})$ by

$$\alpha\star_{(\underline{\alpha},w)}\beta=\sum_{A\in H_2(M)}\sum_{k,l}\sum_{m\ge0}\frac{\epsilon(\{t_i\})}{m!} \tag{6.24}$$
$$\mathcal{GW}^{(\omega,\mu,J)}_{A,0,3+k+m}([\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,3+k+m}];\underline{\alpha},\alpha,\beta,\beta_k,\beta_{i_1},\cdots,\beta_{i_m})\eta^{kl}\beta_l t_{i_1}\cdots t_{i_m}q^A,$$

where $\epsilon(\{t_i\})$ is the sign of the induced permutation on odd dimensional β_i. Clearly, (6.23) is the special case of (6.24) at $w=0$. If $w=\sum_{i=1}^L t_i\beta_i\in H^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$, i.e., $t_i\in\mathbb{Q}$, $i=1,\cdots,L$, then $\alpha\star_w\beta\in QH^*(M,\mathbb{Q})$. We still call the operations defined by (6.23) and (6.24) "small quantum product" and "big small product", respectively. However, it is unpleasant that both $\alpha\star_{\underline{\alpha}}\mathbf{1}$ and $\alpha\star_{(\underline{\alpha},w)}\mathbf{1}$ are always zero by Theorem 4.1. After extending it to $QH^*(M,\mathbb{C})=H^*(M,\mathbb{C})\otimes\Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{C})$ by linearity over $\Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{C})$ we as usual can derive from Theorem 5.7

Theorem 6.5. *Let $w\in H^*(M,\mathbb{C})$ and $\underline{\alpha}$ as above. Then*

$$(\alpha\star_{(\underline{\alpha},w)}\beta)\star_{(\underline{\alpha},w)}\gamma=\alpha\star_{(\underline{\alpha},w)}(\beta\star_{(\underline{\alpha},w)}\gamma)$$

for any $\alpha,\beta,\gamma\in H^*(M,\mathbb{C})$. Consequently, $QH^*(M,\mathbb{C})$ is a supercommutative ring without identity under the quantum products in (6.24).

References

[ALP] M. Audin, F.Lalonde and L.Polterovich, *Symplectic rigidity: Lagrangian Submanifolds*, in *Holomorphic Curves in Symplectic Geometry.* Birkhäuser Verlag, Progress in Math., Vol.**117**. (1994).271-318.

[B] K. Behrend, *Gromov-Witten invariants in algebraic geometry*, Invent. Math., **127**(1997), 601-617.

[BoTu] R. Bott and L.-W. Tu, *Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **82**, Springer-Verlag, 1982.

[CR] W. Chen and Y. Ruan, *Orbifold Gromov-Witten Theory*, arXiv.math.AG/0103156, 25 Mar 2001.

[CoKa] D. A. Cox and S. Katz, *Mirror Symmetry and Algebraic Geometry*, Math. Sur. and Monographs, Vol.**68**, AMS.

[FuO] K. Fukaya and K. Ono, *Arnold conjecture and Gromov-Witten invariant*, Topology, **3**8 (1999), 933-1048.

[FuOOO] K. Fukaya, Y.-G. Oh, H. Ohta, and K. Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory - anomaly and obstruction*, Preprint, 2000.

[G] R. E. Greene, *Complete metrics of bounded curvature on noncompact manifolds*, Arch. Math., **3**1 (1978), 89-95.

[Gr1] M. Gromov, *Stable mapping of foliations into manifolds*, Mathematics of the USSR–Isvestija, **3**3 (1969), 671–694.

[Gr2] M. Gromov, *Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds*, Invent. Math., **8**2 (1985), 307–347.

[HS1] H. Hofer and D. A. Salamon, *Floer homology and Novikov rings*, in *The Floer Memorial Volume*, Progress in Math., **1**33, 483-524.

[HS2] H. Hofer and D. A. Salamon, *Marked Riemann surfaces of genus* 0, preprint, 1997.

[IP1] E. -N. Ionel and T. H. Parker, *Relative Gromov-Witten Invariants*, Ann. Math., **157**(2003), 45-96.

[IP2] E. -N. Ionel and T. H. Parker, *Symplectic Sums Formula for Gromov-Witten Invariants*, Ann. Math. **159**(2004), 935-1025.

[IS] S. Ivashkovich and V. Shevchishin, *Complex curves in almost-complex manifolds and meromorphic hulls*, Preprint, math.CV/9912046.

[KM] M. Kontsevich and Y. Manin, *GW classes, Quantum cohomology and enumerative geometry*, Comm. Math. Phys., **164**(1994), 525-562.

[LMP] F. Lalonde, D. McDuff, L. Polterovich, *Topological rigidity of Hamiltonian loops and quantum homology*, Invent. Math., **135** (1999), 369-385.

[LLY1] B. Lian, K. Liu and S.-T. Yau, *Mirror principle, III*, Asian J. Math. **3**(1999), 771-800.

[LLY2] B. Lian, K. Liu and S.-T. Yau, *Mirror principle, IV*, arXiv:math. AG/0007104.

[LeO] Lê Hông Vân and K. Ono, *Cup-length estimate for symplectic fixed points*, in *Contact and Symplectic Geometry*, 268-295, ed. by C. B. Thomas, Publication of the Newton Institute, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.

[LiR] A.-M. Li and Y. Ruan, *Symplectic surgery and Gromov-Witten invariants of Calabi-Yau 3-folds*, Invent. Math., **145**(2001), 151-218.

[LiT1] J. Li and G. Tian, *Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of algebraic varieties*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., **11**(1998), 119-174.

[LiT2] J. Li and G. Tian, *Virtual moduli cycles and Gromov-Witten invariants of general symplectic manifolds*, in *Topic in symplectic* 4*-manifolds*(Irvine, CA, 1996), 47-83, First Int. Press Lect.Ser., I, Internatinal Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998.

[Liu] Gang Liu, *Associativity of Quantum multiplication*, Comm. Math. Phys. **1**91 (1998), 265-282.

[LiuT1] Gang Liu and Gang Tian, *Floer Homology and Arnold Conjecture*, J. Diff. Geom. **4**9 (1998), 1-74.

[LiuT2] Gang Liu and Gang Tian, *Weinstein Conjecture and GW Invariants*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **2** (2000), 405-459.

[LiuT3] Gang Liu and Gang Tian, *On the Equivalence of Multiplicative Structures in Floer Homology and Quantum Homology*, Acta Mathematicae Sinica, English Series, **1**5(1999), 53-80.

[Lu1] Guangcun Lu, *Gromov-Witten invariants and rigidity of Hamiltonian loops with compact support on noncompact symplectic manifolds*, Commun. Anal. Geom., **9** (2001), 1041-1092.

[Lu2] Guangcun Lu, *Gromov-Witten invariants on compact symplectic manifolds with contact type of Boundaries and applications*,in *Progress in Nonlinear Analysis*, edited by K.C. Chang and Y. Long World Scintific Publishing (Singapo, 2000), 176-184.

[Lu3] Guangcun Lu, *An explicit isomorphism between Floer homology and quantum homology*, Pacific J. Math., **213, 2**(2004), 319-363.

[Lu4] Guangcun Lu, *Gromov-Witten invariants and pseudo symplectic capacities*, preprint, math.SG/0103195, v6, 6 September 2001.

[LuT] Lu, G., Tian, G.: *Constructing virtual Euler cycles and class.* In progress.

[Ma] W.-S. Massey, *Singular Homology Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **70**, Springer-Verlag, 1980.

[Mc1] D. McDuff, *The Virtual Module Cycle*, preprint, Dec, 1998.

[Mc2] D. McDuff, *Quantum homology of fibrations over* S^2, Intern. J. Math., **11, 5**(2000), 665-721.

[McSa1] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves and quantum cohomology*, University Lec. Series, Vol. **6**, AMS.

[McSa2] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, *Introduction to Symplectic Topology*, Oxford University Press, 1995.

[R] Y. Ruan, *Virtual neighborhood and pseudo-holomorphic curves*, Turkish J. Math. **2**3(1999), 161-231.

[RT1] Y. Ruan and G. Tian, *A mathematical theory of quantum cohomology*, J. Diff. Geom., **43, 2**(1995).

[RT2] Y. Ruan and G. Tian, *Higher genus symplectic invariants and sigma model coupled with gravity*, Invent. Math., **130**(1997), 455-516.

[Sat] I. Satake, *On a generalization of the notion of manifolds*, Proc. Nat. acad. Sci. USA, **2**(1956), 359-363.

[Sc] A. S. Schwarz, *Topology for Physicists*, Springer-Verlag 1994.

[Sie] B. Siebert, *Gromov-Witten invariants for general symplectic manifolds*, arXiv.org/dg-ga/9608005.

[Sik] J. C. Sikorav, *Some properties of holomorphic curves in almost complex manifolds*, in *Holomorphic Curves in Symplectic Geometry.* Birkhäuser Verlag, Progress in Math., Vol.**117**.(1994).165-189.

[Sk] E. G. Sklyarenko, *Homology and cohomology theories of general spaces*, in *General topology II* (A. V. Arhangel'skii, ed.), Encyclopedia of mathematical sciences, Springer 1996.

[T1] G. Tian, *Quantum Cohomology and Its associativity*, in *Current developments in mathematics*, 1995(Cambridge, MA.), 360-401, Internat. Press.

[T2] G. Tian, *Constructing symplectic invariants*, in *Quantum Cohomology*(P. de Bartolomeis, B. Dubrovin and C. Reina, eds.), Lecture Notes in Math., **1776**, 269-311.

[W1] E. Witten, *Topological sigma models*, Comm. Math. Phys., **118**(1988).

[W2] E. Witten, *Two dimensional gravity and intersection theory on moduli space*, Surveys in Diff. Geom., **1**(1991), 243-310.